

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

(1) Crl. Misc. M 28025 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of decision: 17.11.2016

Mehal Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

(2) Crl. Misc. M 29034 of 2014 (O&M)

Ranjit Kaur

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. PPS Duggall, Advocate
for the petitioners in both the cases.

Mr. Mikail Kad, AAG., Punjab.

Mr. BS Bhalla, Advocate,
for respondents No. 2 and 3 in both the cases.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

The instant petitions came to be filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure with a prayer for passing of an appropriate order to meet the ends of justice for quashing of FIR No. 241 dated 25.9.2013 registered under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Sultan Wind District Amritsar.

Initially when the case came up for hearing, learned counsel for the petitioners had contended that the present petitioners, who have filed the

instant petitions, are father-in-law and mother-in-law of the complainant and they have no role to play in the dispute that has arisen between the parties i.e. their son and daughter-in-law/complainant. It was further argued that the son of the petitioners has already preferred a petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act for restitution of conjugal rights and as such there was possibility of the compromise between the parties. Consequently, by order dated 5.11.2014, the matter was referred to mediation. However, as per report received from mediation, it appears that efforts to settle the dispute amicably have failed.

Learned counsel for the State submits that the challan is ready to be filed against the petitioners. However, because of the stay granted by this Court the same could not be filed.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties.

The instant petition was filed seeking quashing of the FIR, while contending that there was possibility of compromise. Since the mediation has failed and the challan is ready to be filed against the petitioners, the law is to take its own course. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to interfere in this matter. The instant petition stands dismissed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners, at this juncture, prays that the petitioners may be given liberty to approach the appropriate court, after presentation of the challan, seeking for exemption from personal appearance before the trial court. This prayer has been vehemently opposed by learned counsel appearing for the respondents.

In view of the fact that certain dowry recoveries have been

made, the petitioner will be at liberty to approach the trial court seeking exemption from personal appearance.

17.11.2016
prem

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether reportable	No