

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

**254**

**CRM-M-37757-2017  
DATE OF DECISION: 10.11.2017**

**RAKESH JINDAL**

**... Petitioner(s)**

**Versus**

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANR**

**... Respondent(s)**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL**

Present: Mr. B.S. Bhalla, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sandeep Vermani, Addl.A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*\*

**ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL, J. (ORAL)**

The petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.40 dated 24.04.2015, under Section 306/34 IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.1, District Ludhiana City.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the aforementioned FIR, qua the co-accused namely Pritpal Singh has already been quashed on the basis of compromise, by the order dated 25.08.2017 passed by this Court in CRM No.M-30654 of 2016. He further contends that statements of the parties, including the complainant, were recorded before the Additional Sessions Judge wherein the complainant had stated that she had no objection if the FIR is quashed qua the present petitioner also. A copy of statement of complainant is annexed as Annexure P-4. He further states that the present petitioner was not party to the afore-mentioned petition and therefore, the FIR was not quashed qua him. Learned counsel for the petitioner also contends that the

FIR was lodged on the basis of statement of the complainant/respondent No.2-Ranjeet Kaur, alleging therein that her husband had committed suicide. Although reference was made to a suicide note left behind by her husband but the sample of handwriting of the deceased was not provided. The matter was duly enquired by the ADCP, who had also directed the complainant to provide sample of handwriting of the deceased, which she failed to do. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also placed reliance upon a judgment of a Coordinate Bench of this Court in CRM No.M-13349 of 2017, titled as 'Sabita Rani and others Vs.State of Haryana and another', decided on 18.05.2017, wherein FIR under Section 306 IPC was quashed on the basis of compromise.

Heard.

The FIR qua the co-accused Pritpal Singh has already been quashed. In the statement of the complainant which was recorded by the Additional Sessions Judge in pursuance to the directions in CRM-M-30654-2017, it was also stated that the complainant has compromised the matter with regard to the petitioner in the instant case namely Rakesh Jindal.

The relevant extract of the statement of the complainant recorded by the Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana on 09.08.2017 is reproduced hereunder:-

*"I also do not want to pursue the present case against Rakesh Jindal son of Sh. Boj Raj Jindal r/o H.No.384, near Green Land School, Phase-II, Dugri, Ludhiana, the co-accused. I have no objection if the quashing petition bearing*

*No.CRM-M-30654-2016, is accepted by the Hon'ble High Court and the referred FIR is quashed qua both accused. I have brought my voter identification card (original seen and returned) and self attested copy thereof is Ex.C-1."*

In view of the above and the mandate of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466***, no useful purpose will be served by continuing the criminal proceedings. Therefore, the petition is allowed and FIR No.40 dated 24.04.2015, under Section 306/34 IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.1, District Ludhiana City (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the petitioner(s).

**10.11.2017**

*SwarnjitS*

**(ANUPINDER SINGH GREWAL)  
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No