

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

(1) Criminal Misc. No.M-36468 of 2017

.....

Date of decision:10.11.2017

Shamil Kumar alias Pintu and another

.....Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

....

(2) Criminal Misc. No.M-36960 of 2017

.....

Dalip Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

v.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. S.K. Choudhary, Advocate for the petitioners in Cr.
Misc. No.M-36468 of 2017 and for respondents No.2 and 3 in
Cr. Misc. No.M-36960 of 2017.

Mr. S.K. Arya, Advocate for the petitioners in Cr.
Misc. No.M-36960 of 2017 and for respondents No.2 and 3 in
Cr. Misc. No.M-36468 of 2017.

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

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

This order will dispose of the above mentioned two criminal
miscellaneous petitions i.e. Criminal Misc. No.M-36468 of 2017 filed
under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.34 dated 29.6.2017
registered for the offences under Sections 323, 324, 506 and 34 IPC and

(Section 326 IPC which was added later on) at Police Station Taragarh, District Pathankot and Criminal Misc. No.M-36960 of 2017 filed for quashing of DDR/GD No.30 dated 12.7.2017 registered for the offences under Sections 323, 324, 148 and 149 IPC in FIR No.34 dated 29.6.2017 and all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

The FIR and the DDR were got registered against each other by the petitioners of both the petitions as dispute arose as a result of fight between the parties in which injuries were received by both the parties. This is a case of version and cross-version. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, both the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement and have effected a compromise.

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, Pathankot has sent two reports dated 1.11.2017 in both the cases submitting that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine.

Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab, on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for complainants 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 and the DDR 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 State counsel 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 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, these petitions are allowed. FIR No.34 dated 29.6.2017 registered for the offences under Sections 323, 324, 506 and 34 IPC and (Section 326 IPC which was added later on) at Police Station Taragarh, District Pathankot and DDR/GD No.30 dated 12.7.2017 registered for the offences under Sections 323, 324, 148 and 149 IPC in FIR No.34 dated 29.6.2017 and all other subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are hereby quashed qua the petitioners.

November 10, 2017.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

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