

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

Crl. Misc. No. M-38187-2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: May 8, 2017

Amolak Singh and others

.. Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr.Deepak Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioners.
Mr.Ashish Sanghi, DAG, Punjab.
Mr.Nipun Gupta, Advocate, for
Mr.Rohit Mittal, Advocate,
for respondents No.2 and 3.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

The petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 Code of Criminal Procedure (for short, 'Cr.P.C.') seeking quashing of FIR No.171 dated 11.11.2014 (Annexure P-1) along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, registered for offences punishable under Sections 324, 34, 326, 323 Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') at Police Station Maur, District Bathinda on the basis of the compromise (Annexure P-3).

As per case of the prosecution, both the respondents were caused injuries by the petitioners in an occurrence that took place on 9.11.2014 at 6:30 p.m. at Tahla Sahib, Maur, Bathinda. The injuries on the person of the respondents were found grievous and the offence punishable under Section 326 IPC was later on added.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the matter has since been settled vide compromise, copy of which has been placed on file as Annexure P-3.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3-complainant and private respondent endorsed the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners and has no objection if the impugned FIR (Annexure P-1) is quashed.

Learned State counsel has also not disputed compromise (Annexure P-3).

In order to verify the veracity and genuineness of the settlement between the parties, they were directed to appear before the trial court and get their statements recorded. The trial court has sent its report dated 1.12.2016 stating therein that the compromise has been effected between the complainant and the accused which appears to be voluntary in nature and without any pressure or influence.

Keeping all the above facts in view, I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case in which the impugned FIR should be quashed. Keeping the case pending will not serve the ends of justice. The quashing of the FIR will provide the parties to this petition an opportunity to live in an amicable, peaceful and harmonious atmosphere which is not only in the interest of the parties but also for their families and ultimately the society at large.

For the reasons as discussed above, the instant petition is allowed and the impugned FIR No.171 dated 11.11.2014 (Annexure P-1) along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, qua petitioners, is quashed.

May 8, 2017

Paritosh Kumar

**(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE**

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