

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-26264 of 2015
Date of decision: 01.03.2016

Amandeep Singh and others

----Petitioner (s)

V/s

State of Haryana & another

-----Respondent(s)

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

1. Whether reporters of local newspapers may be allowed to see judgment?
2. To be referred to reporters or not?
3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?

Present:- Mr. Arvinder Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashish Yadav, Addl. A.G. Haryana.

Mr. Ashwani Nagra, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

HARI PAL VERMA, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.97, dated 28.03.2012 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, (Annexure P-1), registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-3).

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that he does not press the present petition for quashing qua petitioner No.2-Mrs. Unita wife of Karambir.

Accordingly, the present petition is dismissed as not pressed qua petitioner No.2-Mrs. Unita wife of Karambir.

This Court vide order dated 03.12.2015 had directed the parties to appear before the trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to compromise.

Pursuant to the aforesaid order dated 03.12.2015, the parties have appeared before learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Naraingarh and got their statements recorded. On the basis of the statements so recorded, learned Magistrate has forwarded her report dated 06.01.2016 to the effect that the parties have willfully settled their differences and reached at a bona fide compromise without any pressure and the same is genuine.

The statement suffered by the complainant-respondent No.2, namely, Balkar Singh son of Nathu Ram, before the Magistrate on 05.01.2016, reads as under:-

“ I have compromised the matter in question with Amandeep Singh, Mrs. Unita and Suman Kumar with the intervention of respectables. I do not want to take any legal action against them. I have compromised the said matter without any coercion, pressure and with our sweet will. I have no objection if FIR no. 97 dated 28.3.2012 u/s 419/420/467/468/471/120B IPC registered by me in P.S. Naraingarh be quashed.

Apart from the statement of the complainant-respondent No.2-Balkar Singh, whereby, he has shown no objection to the FIR being quashed, there is nothing on record to doubt the genuineness of the compromise, as arrived between the parties. Thus, no useful purpose would be served to continue with the proceedings in the instant FIR.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2-complainant does

not dispute the factum of compromise effected between the parties.

Learned counsel for the State, on instructions from ASI-Baljeet Singh, does not dispute the factum of compromise entered between the parties.

Accordingly, following the principles laid down by the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 (P&H)**, as approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and others, (2012)10 SCC 303**, this petition is allowed and FIR No.97, dated 28.03.2012 under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC, (Annexure P-1), registered at Police Station Naraingarh, District Ambala, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, qua petitioner No. 1-Amandeep Singh and petitioner No.3-Suman Kumar, are quashed, in view of the compromise (Annexure P-3).

01.03.2016
Anjal

[HARI PAL VERMA]
JUDGE