

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

CRM-M-26698-2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.03.2017

RANDEEP & ORS

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ORS

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present : Mr. Dinesh Arora, Advocate
for the petitioner (s).

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana
assisted by ASI Ashok Kumar, State Crime Panchkula.

Mr. Atul Kaushik, Advocate
for respondent Nos.10, 11, 12 and 15.

None for respondent Nos.13 and 14.

Mr. Sudhir Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Polly Shera, Advocate
for respondent No.16.

Jitendra Chauhan, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for
issuance of directions to respondent Nos.2 and 4 to provide adequate
security to the petitioners; to protect their life and property; and to transfer

the investigation of the FIRs registered on the statement of the petitioners to some independent agency under a Senior Officer not below the rank of Superintendent of Police.

The learned State counsel on instructions informs that three FIRs were registered at the behest of petitioner Nos.1 and 3. In FIR No.231 dated 24.08.2015, registered under Sections 285 and 336 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act, at P.S. Chandimandir, District Panchkula, no substance was found and cancellation report has been prepared which is likely to be filed shortly before the competent Court. In second FIR No.275 dated 14.10.2015, registered under Sections 285 and 336 IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act, P.S. Chandimandir, District Panchkula, all the four accused have been arrested and challan has already been presented and petitioner No.1 has entered into compromise with one of the accused, namely, Sahil Bhalla. On the basis of said compromise, accused, Sahil Bhalla has filed CRM-M-37676-2016 for quashing of the FIR. In third FIR No.129 dated 10.06.2016, registered under Sections 148, 323, 324, 325, 326, 285, 336, 427, 506, 380, 120-B read with Section 149 IPC, at P.S. Chandimandir, District Panchkula, out of six accused, four have been arrested and two are yet to be arrested.

The learned counsel for the petitioners states that all the petitioners are not party to the said compromise.

Heard.

Considering the abovesaid status of the FIRs and the fact that

petitioner No.1 has effected compromise with one of the accused, Sahil Bhalla, no further action is warranted in the matter.

Dismissed.

23.03.2017

ashok

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes / No

Whether reportable: Yes / No