

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM 30619 and 30621 of 2015 in/ and
CRR No.530 of 2012 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.04.2016

Ravinder Singh

.....Petitioner

versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CORAM: Hon'ble Mr.Justice Kuldip Singh

Present: Mr.Vipin Mahajan, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr.A.P.S.Gill, AAG Punjab
Mr.Vishal Munjal, Advocate for the complainant

1. *Whether Reporters of Local Newspapers 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?*

Kuldip Singh, J. (Oral)

CRM 30619 of 2015

Application is allowed and complainant Rajni wife of the petitioner is ordered to be impleaded as respondent No.2 in the present petition.

CRM 30621 of 2015

Application is allowed and with the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the revision petition is taken up on board for hearing today itself.

CRR No.530 of 2012 (O&M)

The petitioner was convicted by learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jalandhar vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 8.3.2011 for the commission of offences punishable

under Sections 498A and 506 IPC in the FIR lodged on the basis of the statement of his wife Rajni Jyoti. Appeal against the said judgment of the lower Court was dismissed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar on 6.2.2012. Husband Ravinder Singh has filed this revision against the judgment of conviction and order of sentence of both the Courts below.

During hearing, it comes out that the parties have effected compromise before the Mediation Centre, Gurdaspur. Copy of the compromise has been placed on file. On behalf of the complainant Rajni Jyoti, Mr.Vishal Munjal, Advocate has put in appearance and has also confirmed that the parties have entered into compromise under which, both the parties have got divorce by mutual consent and the complainant has no objection if the accused petitioner Ravinder Singh is acquitted of the offences on account of the compromise. The offence under Section 406 IPC is compoundable offence, whereas offence under Section 498A IPC is non compoundable offence. Keeping in view the fact that both the parties have lawfully compounded the offence, the present petitioner stands acquitted under Section 406 IPC. Since offence under Section 498A IPC has arisen out of the same facts and the allegations have been withdrawn by the wife, therefore, the petitioner also stands acquitted for the offence under Section 498A IPC.

The revision is accordingly allowed.

22.04.2016

gk

(Kuldip Singh)
Judge