

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

Date of decision : 17.05.2016

(i) CRM M-36777 of 2014

Santokh Singh & anr.

....Petitioners

V/s

State of Punjab & anr.

....Respondents

(ii) CRM M-9789 of 2015

Santokh Singh & anr.

....Petitioners

V/s

State of Punjab & anr.

....Respondents

BEFORE : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJAN GUPTA

Present: Mr. Joginder Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.
(in CRM M-36777 of 2014)
Ms. Shikha Khullar, Advocate for the petitioners
(in CRM M-9789 of 2015)

Mr. Ankur Jain, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Pawan Kumar, Advocate for respondent no. 2.

RAJAN GUPTA J.

This order will dispose of aforesaid two petitions.

Petitioners seek quashing of FIR(s) on the basis of compromise. FIR was lodged on the complaint of Ranjit Singh, father-in-law of respondent no. 2. He alleged that accused promised that he was aware of land which would be available at quite reasonable price and complainant would earn handsome profit. On this allurements, complainant borrowed money from his relatives and parted with ₹2 crores & 25 lacs. As accused did not

live up to the promise, he asked him to refund the amount. Accused issued various cheques of huge amounts. Same bounced on presentation. In the year 2012, complainant died his natural death. Later, accused started threatening the husband of respondent no. 2. As a result, he committed suicide and another FIR No. 6 dated 07.01.2014 was registered against the accused under section 306 IPC at police station Jodhan, District Ludhiana on complaint of wife of the deceased. In my considered view, no case for quashing of both the FIRs is made out. Admittedly, investigation of both the cases is still pending. In view of nature of allegations, proceedings need to be taken to their logical end. Compromise effected by complainant on behalf of a dead person can be of no avail (see *CRM M-22257 of 2014* titled as *Kulvir Singh vs. State of Punjab*). Both petitions are without any merit and are hereby dismissed. Report received in *CRM M-36777 of 2014* pursuant to order dated 23.01.2015 is of no consequence. Investigating agency would proceed as per law.

May 17, 2016

Ajay

(RAJAN GUPTA)
JUDGE