

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-No.26755 of 2017

Date of Decision:22.09.2017

Kailash Kaur and anotherPETITIONERS
Vs.

State of Haryana and anotherRESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT RAWAL

Present: Mr.Tara Chand Dhanwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr.Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr.Vikas Kumar, Advocate for the complainant/
respondent no.2.

AMIT RAWAL J.(Oral)

In pursuance to the notice dated 26.07.2017, Mr.Vikas Kumar, Advocate, has appeared on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed a reply by way of affidavit of respondent No.2, namely Jasmer Singh, confirming to the contents of the event and the compromise dated 15.07.2017(Annexure P-5) in the matter seeking quashing of the FIR No.303, dated 30.03.2017 for offence punishable under Sections 384 and 388 IPC, registered at Police Station Thanesar City District Kurukshetra (Annexure P-1), on the premise that the matter is under investigation and no challan so far as has been filed. The accused in the aforementioned FIR have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court vide order dated 09.08.2017 passed in CRM-M-15945 of 2017, titled as "Geeta Vs. State of Haryana" and vide another order dated 09.08.2017 passed in CRM-M-16608 of 2017, titled as "Kailash Kaur Vs. State of Haryana." The copy of the said orders filed in Court today, which are taken on record. The factum of joining the investigation has also been endorsed by the I.O. The said

affidavit is taken on record.

I am of the view that instead of relegating the parties, i.e. the complainant and the accused, to the concerned Magistrate for recording statement, as no challan has been filed, the complainant and petitioner/accused are at liberty to approach the concerned IO/SHO and apprise the factum of compromise, so that the police completes the investigation by submitting a closure report.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

(AMIT RAWAL)
JUDGE

22.09.2017
Anjal

Whether speaking/reasoned? Yes/No

Whether reportable? Yes/No