

CRM-M-11144-2017

[1]

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

(Sr.No.263)

CRM-M-11144-2017

Date of Decision:-May 31, 2017

Raj Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

V/S

UT of Chandigarh and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present : Mr. D.S. Nigha, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sukant Gupta, Addl.P.P. for UT Chandigarh.

Mr. Gurmeet Singh, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 and 3.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

In FIR No.62 dated 10.03.2014 registered under Sections 380/411 and 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 411 and 34 of IPC were added lateron) at Police Station Sector 31, Chandigarh the petitioners are being prosecuted.

Learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 state that the compromise has been arrived at between the parties. This Court had directed the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to record the statements vide order dated April 24, 2017 in view of the compromise effected between the parties and verify that whether the same is genuine or not. Now, there is a report

received from the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Chandigarh showing that the statements of the parties have been recorded and compromise that has been arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure, coercion or undue influence.

Looking to the nature of the offences registered in the FIR, I think, parties should be allowed to compound/compromise the offences in order to live in peace and harmony.

In that view of the matter, FIR No.62 dated 10.03.2014 registered under Sections 380/411 and 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 411 and 34 of IPC were added lateron) at Police Station Sector 31, Chandigarh is quashed by way of compounding/compromise along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

Disposed of.

May 31, 2017

pankaj

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No