

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

257

CRL. MISC. No.M-30123 OF 2016 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION : 6th FEBRUARY, 2017

Manish & another

.... **Petitioners**

Versus

State of Haryana & others

.... **Respondents**

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

* * * *

Present : Mr. S. K. Yadav, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Arjun Singh Yadav, AAG, Haryana.

Ms. Bhawna Grewal, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

* * * *

A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.11 dated 01.01.2016 registered under Sections 186, 323, 34, 341, 353 & 506 IPC and Section 68/1/14 of Punjab Excise Act at Police Station City Narnaul, in view of compromise.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent/complainant submits that compromise has been arrived at between the parties.

This Court had made order dated 15.12.2016 asking for recording of statement in order to find out the correctness and genuineness of the compromise said to have been arrived at between the parties.

Accordingly, statements have been recorded by the trial Court and report has been received by this Court. Looking to the report it is seen that the compromise is voluntary and genuine. I have seen the

offences registered against the petitioners. Looking to the nature of the offence I think the compromise/compounding should be allowed.

In view of the above, I make the following order:

ORDER

- (i) CRL. MISC. No.M-30123 OF 2016 is allowed.
- (ii) The FIR No.11 dated 01.01.2016 registered under Sections 186, 323, 34, 341, 353 & 506 IPC and Section 68/1/14 of Punjab Excise Act at Police Station City Narnaul, is quashed along with all consequential, subject to deposit of costs of ₹10,000/- each with the State by both the parties.

6th February, 2017
'raj'

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes	No
Whether Reportable:	Yes	No.