

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

CRL. MISC. No.M-9638 OF 2017
DATE OF DECISION : 30TH MAY, 2017

Mukhtiar Ahmed & others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & another

.... Respondents

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

* * * *

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

Mr. P. S. Bajwa, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Robin Bansal, Advocate for the complainant.

* * * *

A. B. CHAUDHARI, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.34 dated 18.04.2012 registered under Sections 326, 323, 341, 427, 148 & 149 IPC and Section 25/27/25 (54) of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Malerkotla, District Sangrur, in view of compromise.

Heard learned counsel for the rival parties.

Learned counsel appearing for complainant submits that compromise has been arrived at between the parties.

This Court had made order dated 23.03.2017 asking for recording of statement in order to find out the correctness and genuineness of the compromise said to have been arrived at between the parties.

Accordingly, statements have been recorded by the trial Court and report has been received by this Court. Looking to the report it is seen that the compromise is voluntary and genuine. I have seen the offences registered against the petitioners. Looking to the nature of the offence I think the compromise/compounding should be allowed.

In view of the above, I make the following order:

ORDER

- (i) CRL. MISC. No.M-9638 OF 2017 is allowed.
- (ii) FIR No.34 dated 18.04.2012 registered under Sections 326, 323, 341, 427, 148 & 149 IPC and Section 25/27/25 (54) of Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station City Malerkotla, District Sangrur, is quashed along with all consequential proceedings, qua the petitioners.

30TH MAY, 2017
'raj'

(A. B. CHAUDHARI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes* *No*

Whether Reportable : *Yes* *No*