

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

CRM-M-43953 of 2016 (O&M)
Date of decision: 24.03.2017

Vinod Kumar and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Ram Pal Verma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Arun Kumar, AAG, Haryana.

None for respondent No.2 despite service.

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

This petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure has been filed for quashing of FIR No. 284 dated 21.07.2012, registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B of IPC, at Police Station Ganaur, District Sonapat and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

It is contended that the parties have compromised the matter. In pursuance of order dated 08.12.2016, the parties have recorded their respective statements.

The learned State counsel, on instructions states that

statements of the parties have been recorded. The case is fixed for arguments before the trial Court.

Heard.

The present FIR has been lodged on the basis of complaint moved by respondent No.2 against the petitioners levelling the allegations that the petitioners have cheated students of respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 is the president of Satkhumba Siksa Society Kheri Khujjar, District Sonapat and he is running M.V.M. Senior Secondary School. In the year 2010, petitioner Nos. 1, 2 & 4 through petitioner No.3 had approached respondent No.2 stating that they had come regarding JBT admission of children in Jammu in Session 2009-2011 and demanded Rs.40,000/- per student whereby around 40 students have given the amount to the petitioners, however, they were not given admission and in this manner, the petitioners have cheated and defrauded the students. Learned State counsel refers to the reply filed of DSP, Ganaur, Sonipat filed on behalf of the State in Court today to submit that the students have duly supported the case of the prosecution before the trial Court. It is to be noticed that respondent No.2 is not the only aggrieved party and the remaining victims of the fraud committed by the petitioners have not been impleaded as party in the present case. Therefore, considering the

nature of offence, this Court is not inclined to accept the prayer made in the present petition. Accordingly, the same is dismissed.

24.03.2017

sumit.k

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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