

128 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision-06.04.2017

1. CRM-M-10944-2017

Sukhdev and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

2. CRM-M-10945-2017

Sukhdev and others

...Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. K.P.Singh, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.

This judgment shall dispose of aforementioned two petitions as the petitioners in both the petitions are same and they are seeking quashing of FIR No.47 dated 01.03.2016 registered under Sections 328, 420, 294, 500, 120-B and 506 of Indian Penal Code (in short 'IPC') at Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula and FIR No.62 dated 04.04.2016 registered under Sections 306 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Chandimandir, District Panchkula.

The brief facts of the present case are that the instant case was registered on the statement of one Om Parkash Rana which is as under:-

“We are five brothers. Eldest is Sh.Surjit Singh, younger to him is Labh Singh, younger to him is Vikram Singh, younger to him is myself and youngest was Purshotam Singh. My younger brother Purshotam was running an electrical articles shop in village Barwala

and was residing in the village alongwith the family. He had one daughter namely, Anjali Rana, aged 20 years and one son namely, Vishal Rana aged 17 years. My niece Anjali Rana has acquaintance with Tanya daughter of Sukhdev, caste Baniya of village Barwala itself. My niece Anjali had lodged case No.47 dated 01.03.2016 under Sections 328, 420, 294, 500, 506 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Chandi Mandir against Paras son of Sukhdev. Sukhdev son of Bal Kishan, Shashi Bala wife of Sukhdev, Tanya daughter of Sukhdev and Brij Mohan son of Bal Kishan but Paras and his family members had filed cases in Court by filing complaints levelling different allegations against my brother Purshotam and our family members had filed false cases and Paras son of Sukhdev. Tanya daughter of Sukhdev, Suresh son of Sukhdev, Shashi Bala wife of Sukhdev, Sukhdev son of Sh. Bal Kishan, Brij Mohan son of Sh. Bal Kishan Victor son of Bal Kishan Ravinder alias Tony son of Bal Kishan, Rajesh alias Jassi son of Bal Kishan and Yogesh Jangra son of Shish Pal, resident of Barwala, District Panchkula had repeatedly taunted us in public view as well as in alone and had mentally tortured me and my family members. In the same manner, when myself and my brother alongwith our family were going to pay prayers in the Shiv Temple on the day of Shivratri, Victor, Ravinder alias Tony and Yogesh Jangra they all, came in front of us, obstructed our way and threatened to take away my niece Anjali and we had rescued Anjali with great difficulty. The aforesaid persons were hurling repeated threats to take away Anjali from the house, due to which my brother became fed up and used to be mentally upset. Suresh and Yogesh used to hurl repeated threats in front our house and on the shop of my brother that our daughter Anjali will openly be lifted away from the house and they will enjoy a party at Royal Palace. Due to their threats, a bad name was tagged with us in the village and surrounding area, however, we used to keep mum due to social reputation. Due to repeated

taunts by all the aforesaid persons in public view as well as in alone and due to false cases, my brother was feeling much mentally tortured and fed up. Having fed up by tortures meted out by them, today dated 04.04.2016 at about 3.00 O'clock, my brother Purshotam hanged himself by a plastic rope with the ceiling fan in the room made for prayers in his house and ended his life. My brother Labh Singh informed me about this incident, on which I had reached the spot. My brother, Purshotam has ended his life on having become fed up by repeated tortures meted out to him by all the aforesaid people.”

It is contended by learned counsel for the petitioners that with the intervention of the relatives and respectable, parties have effected compromise in the matter. It is further contended that the aforesaid FIRs be quashed on the basis of compromise.

Heard.

Having considered the gravity of offence and the fact that one person has died, this Court feels that no compromise can be allowed in the present case.

Consequently, both petitions are dismissed.

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

April 06, 2017
vanita

Whether speaking/reasoned :	Yes	No
Whether Reportable :	Yes	No