

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

-.-

253

Crl. Misc. M 19993 of 2016

Date of decision: 22.02.2017

Rajat Batra and others

..... *Petitioners*

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....*Respondents*

Coram: Hon'ble Mrs. Justice Rekha Mittal

-.-

Present: Mr. Naveen Bawa, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. Mikhail Kad, AAG, Punjab

Ms Amrita Nagpal, Advocate
for respondent No. 2

-.-

Rekha Mittal, J.

Through the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (in short, 'Cr.P.C.'), the petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No.161 dated 14.10.2014 for offence punishable under Sections 341, 323 and 498-A read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code (in short, 'IPC') registered with Police Station Division No. 4, District Ludhiana City and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 07.05.2016 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Counsel for the petitioners states that petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 have mutually decided to resolve their personal differences and also decided to part ways vide compromise deed dated

07.05.2016.

Vide orders dated 07.12.2016, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, a report has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been recorded and they have voluntarily compromised the matter.

Counsel for the State does not dispute genuineness of the compromise in view of report of the trial Court.

Counsel for respondent No. 2 has conceded to the position.

A perusal of allegations in the FIR reveals that the present case squarely falls in that category of cases which can be quashed by the High Court, in exercise of its inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. Keeping in view the authoritative enunciation of law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in '*Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another*', 2012(4) *R.C.R. (Criminal)* 543 and in the light of facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the considered opinion that continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law and it is expedient in the interest of justice that criminal proceedings are put to an end.

In this view of the matter, the petition is allowed and FIR No.161 dated 14.10.2014 for offence punishable under Sections 341, 323 and 498-A read with Section 34 IPC registered with Police Station Division No. 4, District Ludhiana City and proceedings emanating therefrom on the

basis of compromise dated 07.05.2016, stand quashed qua the petitioners.
The parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of compromise.

(Rekha Mittal)
Judge

22.02.2017
mohan bimbra

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
whether reportable	:	Yes/No