

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-34833 of 2016

.....

Date of decision:1.5.2017

Narinder Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Bikramjeet Singh Jatana, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Shivali, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab for the respondent-State.

Ms. Mannat Anand, Advocate for Munish Raj Chaudhary, Advocate for complainant-respondent No.2.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.166 dated 22.8.2016 (Annexure-P.1) registered for the offences under Sections 365, 323, 341, 148 and 149 IPC at Police Station Patran, District Patiala and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise (Annexure-P.2).

The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Pritpal Singh on the allegations that the accused-petitioners, who were in Bolero vehicle, gave beating to him and inflicted injuries. When his brother Makhan Singh, who was coming behind him, tried to rescue the complainant, then the above said persons forcibly put him in the Bolero

vehicle and after kidnapping brought him at the office of liquor shop and forcibly put liquor in his mouth. They gave beating to him and took him to Patiala in the same vehicle. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties and they have resolved their disputes and differences.

Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before learned trial Court for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. After doing the needful, learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Samana, has sent his report dated 16.11.2016 submitting that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 admit the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab and have gone through the record.

In a decision, based on compromise, none of the parties is a loser. Rather, compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society. After considering the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that

[3]

both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, continuance of criminal prosecution would be an exercise in futility, as the chances of ultimate conviction are bleak.

Therefore, keeping in view the fact that the matter has been amicably settled and in view of the law laid by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Cr.) 543, this petition is allowed and FIR No.166 dated 22.8.2016 (Annexure-P.1) registered for the offences under Sections 365, 323, 341, 148 and 149 IPC at Police Station Patran, District Patiala and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are hereby quashed qua the petitioners.

May 1, 2017.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No