

234

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

CRM-M-15647 of 2016

Date of decision: August 29, 2017

Avtar Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. A.S. Brar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Samina Dhir, DAG Punjab.

Mr. Vishal R. Lamba, Advocate for

Mr. H.S. Mavi, Advocate for respondent No.2.

A.B. CHAUDHARI, J (Oral)

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Petitioners seek quashing of criminal complaint No.639/10.01.2009/04.08.2012, under Sections 166, 167, 418, 463, 464, 465, 470, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'IPC') and Sections 7, 8, 10, 13(1) (II) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988 (for short 'P.C. Act') (charges framed under Section 166, 167 and 120-B IPC against accused No.2 to 4).

Learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 submit that the compromise has been arrived at between the parties.

This Court had directed the parties to appear before the trial Court for recording of statements. Pursuant thereto, now, there is

a report from learned SDJM, Nihal Singh Wala stating that the statements have been recorded and the compromise is genuine and not the result of any threat, coercion or undue influence in any manner.

In that view of the matter, this petition is allowed. Criminal complaint No.639/10.01.2009/04.08.2012, under Sections 166, 167, 418, 463, 464, 465, 470, 120-B of IPC and Sections 7, 8, 10, 13(1) (II) of P.C. Act (charges framed under Section 166, 167 and 120-B IPC against accused No.2 to 4) alongwith all consequential proceedings, is quashed by way of compounding/compromise.

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

August 29, 2017

mahavir

Whether speaking/ reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No