

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Date of decision : May 11, 2016

1. CRM No. M-42795 of 2015

Jangir Singh and others

...Petitioners...

versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents...

2. CRM No.M-43111 of 2015

Chanan Singh and others

...Petitioners...

versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents...

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASPAL SINGH

Present : Mr. Amandeep Chhabra, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Arjinder Singh Sidhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Anoop Singla, Advocate for
Mr. Karan Sachdeva, Advocate,
for respondent No.2 in CRM-M-42795-2015.

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

JASPAL SINGH, J.

This order shall dispose of aforesaid two petitions i.e
CRM No. M-42795 of 2015, captioned as “**Jangir Singh and others**
vs. State of Punjab and another” and CRM No. M-43111 of 2015,

captioned as ***“Chanan Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another”***.

2. CRM No. M-42795 of 2015 has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of FIR No. 39, dated 28.06.2011, under Sections 324, 323, 148 and 149 IPC, Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and all the consequent proceedings thereon, on the basis of compromise.

3. CRM No. M-43111 of 2015, has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of cross case registered vide Rapt No. 13, dated 28.06.2011, under Sections 324, 323, and 34 IPC, Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib in FIR No. 39, dated 28.06.2011, under Sections 324, 323, 148 and 149 IPC, Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and all the subsequent proceedings thereon, on the basis of compromise.

4. Reports of learned trial Court have been received, in which, it has been categorically observed that the statements made by the parties are voluntarily and their compromise has been arrived at without any pressure or undue influence from either side. Even otherwise, matter involved is personal in nature, which stood amicably settled.

5. So, in view of above circumstances, I am of the considered opinion that continuation of criminal proceedings between the parties would be an abuse of the process of law and the present compromise is for their benefit and will bring peace and harmony between them.

6. Consequently, both petitions are allowed and FIR No. 39, dated 28.06.2011, under Sections 324, 323, 148 and 149 IPC, Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, as also cross case No. 13, dated 28.06.2011, under Sections 324, 323, and 34 IPC, Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib in FIR No. 39, dated 28.06.2011, under Sections 324, 323, 148 and 149 IPC, Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, as well as all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner(s).

May 11, 2016
sonika

(JASPAL SINGH)
JUDGE