

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

**CRM-M-34982 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 20.01.2017**

Tej Pal Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: Mr. S.S. Kamboj, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Neeraj Yadav, AAG, Punjab
for the State.

Mr. Saroj Malakar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (ORAL)

Through the present petition, quashing of FIR No.46, dated 03.03.2016, under Section 434 I.P.C. and Section 3 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984, registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1), is sought for on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

Through order of this Court dated 23.11.2016, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court to get their statements recorded, who in turn was directed to send a report to this Court as also to apprise this

has been declared proclaimed offender.

As directed, report dated 09.01.2017 from the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jalandhar has been received, as per which the parties recorded their statements before the trial Court in terms of the compromise arrived at between them and none of the accused is proclaimed offender.

In view of the above, continuation of the proceedings in pursuance of the afore-referred FIR would be an abuse of the process of law and in terms of the law laid down by the Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others versus State of Haryana and others, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, I deem it just and proper to allow the petition and resultantly quash FIR No.46, dated 03.03.2016, under Section 434 I.P.C. and Section 3 of Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984, registered at Police Station Rama Mandi, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) and all proceedings arising therefrom. Ordered accordingly.

20.01.2017
sk

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No