

CRM-M-9576-2017

[1]

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

(Sr.No.279)

CRM-M-9576-2017

Date of Decision:-April 27, 2017

Ravi Dutt and others

.....Petitioners

V/S

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.B. CHAUDHARI

Present : Mr. Vivek Goyal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Arjun Singh Yadav, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Raghav Sharma, Advocate, for respondent No.2.

A.B. Chaudhari, J. (Oral)

Reply has been filed by the State counsel today in Court and the same is taken on record.

Rule. Heard forthwith with the consent of the rival parties.

It is not in dispute that there are the cross cases between the parties. Learned counsel for the parties before me make a statement that the parties to the petition are closely related. They have now entered into a compromise with a view to mitigate of all the cases including the criminal cases.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has invited my attention to the compromise-Annexure P-4 dated 12.12.2015 that has been arrived at between the parties.

In the meanwhile, the petitioners were convicted and sentenced by the trial Court. The judgment of conviction and sentence has been

challenged by them before the Sessions Court in CRA Registration No.82 of 2015. The said criminal appeal is pending before the appellate Court. This petition has been filed by the petitioners in terms of the said compromise that has been arrived at between the parties. It appears from the record that the compromise in question and copy thereof was also filed before the appellate Court.

Looking to the nature of the offences for which the petitioners were convicted, I think compounding/compromise in relation to the same in order that the parties live in peace and harmony should be allowed. However, at the same time it cannot be forgotten that both the parties have utilized the police machinery as well as judiciary for all these and now they have arrived at a compromise. Both the parties cannot be allowed to get away in this manner. Hence, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioners as well as respondent No.2 to deposit costs in the sum of ₹7,500/- each (total in ₹30,000/-) with the office of Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra within a period of three months from today and the same shall be forfeited to the State government. Hence, the following order is passed:-

ORDER

1. The petitioners as well as respondent No.2 both shall deposit costs in the sum of ₹7,500/- each (total in ₹30,000/-) with the office of Superintendent of Police, Kurukshetra within a period of three months from today, which shall be forfeited to the State government.
2. Subject to the compliance of the above condition, the FIR as well as judgment of conviction stands quashed

and set aside by way of compromise/compounding.

3. If, the costs as aforesaid is not deposited within the stipulated period, this order shall come to an end automatically without reference to this Court.

April 27, 2017
pankaj

(A.B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

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