

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

**Crl. Misc. No. M-24484 of 2016
Date of Decision:09.10.2017**

Dipankar De

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARI PAL VERMA

Present:- Mr. Jeevan Gautam, Advocate for Mr. Parminder Singh,
Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Manish Bansal, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sachin Jain, Advocate for respondent No.3.

Hari Pal Verma, J.(Oral)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C is for quashing of Kalendra titled as State and Ranjana Guha Thakurta v. Dipankar De initiated by Executive Magistrate-cum-DCP, Faridabad under Section 107/151 Cr.P.C.

As per Annexure P.4 dated 02.07.2016, the Executive Magistrate, NIT, Faridabad had given a notice under Section 107/111 Cr.P.C to the petitioner to show cause as to why the accused should not be ordered to execute a personal bond in the sum of ₹50,000/- each with one surety in the like amount for keeping peace for a period of one year and accordingly, the accused had furnished a personal bond in the sum of ₹50,000/- with one surety in the like amount through his counsel . Accused was admitted on bail. Learned State Counsel states that in view of order dated 02.07.2016, the petitioner has completed that period.

I have heard counsel for the parties. Even otherwise vide order dated August 31, 2016, the matter was referred to Mediation and

Conciliation Centre of this Court and the proceedings before the Executive Magistrate, NIT, Faridabad under Section 107/151 Cr.P.C were kept in abeyance. The parties have joined the mediation proceedings and a compromise dated 18.11.2016 has been arrived at between the parties wherein the parties have resolved their dispute and the relevant paragraphs 5 and 6 of the compromise deed reads as under:-

- “5. It has been mutually agreed that second party will appear and give statement before this Hon'ble High Court for getting the quashing petition allowed of the petitioner bearing No.CRM-M-24484 of 2016 titled as Dipankar De Vs. State of Haryana and others wherein the party of the second part is the complainant. The said statement for quashing by the second party shall be given after the passing of decree of divorce. It is also consented that non appearance by the party of second part after the decree of divorce before this Hon'ble High Court, it will be deemed that the consent for quashing is given by the party of second part.
6. The parties have resolved not to file any civil and criminal cases against each other before any Court from today onwards qua the present matrimonial dispute and any litigation found pending filed by the parties shall be withdrawn by them.”

In view of the above facts and when the matter has been compromised between the parties in mediation proceedings and the

period for which Kalendra was issued is already over, the present petition no more survives and is rendered infructuous.

Disposed of as having become infructuous.

October 09, 2017
renu

(HARI PAL VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No

Whether reportable? Yes/No