

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-24409-2016

Date of decision: July 21, 2016.

Ashish Chaudhary and another

... **Petitioners**

v.

State of Haryana and another

... **Respondents**

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI**

Present: Shri Ajender Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

Shri Ajeet Pal Singh Pakka, Advocate for respondent No.2.

1. *Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment ?*
2. *Whether to be referred to the Reporters or not ?*
3. *Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?*

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral):

Heard learned Counsel for the rival parties. Counsel for the complainant is also present. He has made a categorical statement that the complainant has decided to compound/compromise in FIR No.149 dated 9.4.2016, registered under Sections 323, 34, 506 IPC at Police Station City Narnaul, District Mahendergarh.

Since the parties have compromised and the compromise deed is filed on record as Annexure P-2, I think even if the trial is allowed to continue, success in the trial is not likely for the prosecution. In that view of the matter, the present petition is allowed and the FIR in question, along with all the consequential proceedings, is quashed.

July 21, 2016.

kadyan

[**A.B. Chaudhari**]
Judge