

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

(289)

CRM-M-25280-2016

Date of Decision:-20.10.2016

Sarabjit Singh alias Sarbha

...Petitioners

V/S

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

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

Present : Mr. G.S. Toor, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. K.S. Sidhu, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Sumeet Puri, Advocate,
for the complainant.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

In FIR No.12 dated 01.02.2016 registered under Sections 308, 323 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Neianwala District Bathinda, the petitioner is being prosecuted.

Mr. Sumeet Puri, learned counsel for the complainant states that now there is a compromise (Annexure P-2) has been arrived at between the parties. This Court vide order dated September 19, 2016 had directed the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to record the statements of the parties in view of the compromise and verify that whether the same is genuine or not.

Now, there is a report received from Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Bathinda, showing that the statements of the parties have been recorded and compromise that is arrived at between the parties with the

intervention of the respectable persons is genuine and without any pressure, coercion or undue influence.

Looking to the nature of the offences registered in FIR and terms of the compromise deed (Annexure P-2), I think, parties should be allowed to compound/compromise the offences in order that they live in peace and harmony.

In that view of the matter, FIR No.12 dated 01.02.2016 registered under Sections 308, 323 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Neianwala District Bathinda is quashed by way of compounding/compromise along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

Disposed of .

October 20, 2016

pankaj

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No