

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

CRM-M-9418-2017 (O&M)
Date of decision : 09.05.2017

Parshotam Lal and others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: Mr. Parveen Sharma, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. R.S. Nain, AAG, Punjab

Respondent No.2-Ajay Kumar, present in person with
Mr. Sarju Puri, Advocate

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J. (Oral)

It has been pointed out that inadvertently in the memo of parties, State of Haryana has been arrayed as respondent No.1 instead of State of Punjab. The mistake being typographical, on the oral request of learned counsel for the petitioners, State of Punjab is arrayed as respondent No.1 in place of State of Haryana. Mr. R.S. Nain, AAG, Punjab, present in the Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1.

The Registry is directed to carry out the necessary correction in the memo of parties.

This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of FIR No.18 dated 18.05.2012, registered under Sections 307, 326, 323, 506 and 148 read with Section 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act (added later on), at Police Station

Pojewal, Distt. SBS Nagar, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

In pursuance of order dated 20.03.2017, report of learned SDJM, Balachaur (SBS Nagar) has been received. As per the report, the parties did not appear before the trial Court to get their statement recorded with regard to compromise (Annexure P-5) reached between the parties. However, the learned counsel for the parties state that the statement of injured/respondent No.2 in fact has been recorded.

At this stage, the learned counsel for respondent No.2, on instructions, states that after the compromise reached between the parties, the petitioners have again resorted to issuing threats to respondent No.2 and there is serious apprehension to his life and liberty at the hands of the petitioners. The injuries suffered by respondent No.2 are the loss of one little finger of his right hand and total loss of vision of left eye.

Heard.

In view of the injuries suffered by respondent No.2 and the threat perceptions received by him from the petitioners, disentitles the petitioners from the relief sought on the basis of compromise, which in the opinion of this Court itself is a result of force, coercion and intimidation.

Accordingly, the instant petition is dismissed.

09.05.2017

ashok

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes / No
Yes / No

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE