

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.248

CRM-M No.9090 of 2017 (O&M)
Date of decision: 26.05.2017

Mahesh Gupta and another

...Petitioners

versus

Union of Territory, Chandigarh Administration, Chandigarh and another
....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK SIBAL

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Sukant Gupta, APP U.T., Chandigarh.

* * *

DEEPAK SIBAL, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., seeking quashing of FIR No.168 dated 02.04.2013, registered under Sections 420, 120-B IPC, at Police Station, Sector 34, U.T., Chandigarh, on the basis of compromise having been arrived at between the petitioners and the complainant.

On 24.03.2017, this Court had passed the following order:-

Notice of motion for 26.05.2017.

Through the present petition, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.168 dated 02.04.2013, registered under Sections 420, 120-B IPC, at Police Station Sector 34, Chandigarh, along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise.

The petitioners, through their counsel, are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 03.04.2017, on which date the Illaqa Magistrate/trial court shall summon respondent no. 2

also and record the statements of the parties to the effect that the compromise has actually been arrived at between them. After recording of the statements, the trial court would furnish to this Court its report along with the recorded statements on or before the adjourned date, clearly opining therein with respect to the veracity of the compromise, if any, between the parties.

The Illaqa Magistrate/trial court would also apprise this Court whether the accused are ever declared as Proclaimed Offenders and if there is any other case pending against them.

The report dated 23.05.2017 has been received from the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chandigarh, which is to the effect that the parties did not appear before the Court to get their statements recorded in terms of the order of this Court dated 24.03.2017.

The office has also reported that notices could not be issued as counsel did not file the process fee.

There is also no appearance on behalf of the petitioners.

Dismissed for non-prosecution.

(DEEPAK SIBAL)
JUDGE

May 26, 2017

Jyoti 1

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