

Date of Decision : 13.10.2017

.....Petitioners

Versus

.....Respondents

Present : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

SUDIP AHLUWALIA, J. (ORAL)

With the intervention of respectable and elderly people of the society, the complainant has arrived at a settlement with the accused vide Mutual Compromise (Annexure P-2), which is duly signed by him. The matter was referred to the Court below for recording of statements of the parties and to report with respect to genuineness of the compromise arrived at between the parties. The Ld. Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Kapurthala, vide report dated 07.10.2017, has apprised this Court that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure.

Neha
2017.10.23 15:22
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

which shows that they have no objection to the compromise and quashing of the FIR. However, they have admitted the factum of compromise before the Ld. Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Kapurthala.

In view of the report of the Ld. Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Kapurthala, and in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in “Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another”, 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543 and “Narinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another”, (2014) 6 SCC 466, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose can be served by keeping with the criminal proceedings pending, since the complainant has himself compromised the dispute with the petitioner/accused person.

In the circumstances, the present petition is allowed. F.I.R. No. 64, dated 15.07.2014, under Sections 324/506/148/149 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Bholath, District Kapurthala, (Annexure P-1), and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed on the basis of compromise *qua* the present petitioners.

(SUDIP AHLUWALIA)
JUDGE

13.10.2017
Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No