

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

Crl. Misc. No. M-10279 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: July 11, 2018

Manpreet Singh and another

.. Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. Vidit Bansal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Amitoj Singh Dhaliwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Puneet Pali, Advocate for
Mr. Mohd. Saleem, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

SURINDER GUPTA, J.(Oral)

The petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 Code of Criminal Procedure (for short, 'Cr.P.C.') seeking quashing of FIR No.81 dated 27.12.2016 (Annexure P-1), registered for offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 506 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') at Police Station Moti Nagar, Ludhiana, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 23.01.2018 (Annexure P-2).

As per case of the prosecution, there was matrimonial dispute between petitioner No.1 and respondent No.3. On 12.09.2016, during the inquiry, the parties were present at Police Station N.R.I. Ludhiana, where petitioners in furtherance of their common intention, assaulted and gave

beatings to Amandeep Kaur and snatched her golden chain and ear-rings.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that matrimonial dispute between petitioner No.1 and respondent No.3 has since been settled vide compromise, copy of which has been placed on file as Annexure P-2.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 endorses the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners and has no objection if the impugned FIR (Annexure P-1) is quashed.

Learned State counsel has also not disputed compromise (Annexure P-2).

In order to verify the veracity and genuineness of the settlement between the parties, they were directed to appear before the trial court and get their statements recorded. The trial court has sent its report dated 03.07.2018, stating therein that the compromise has been effected between the complainant and the accused which appears to be voluntary in nature and without any pressure or influence.

Keeping all the above facts in view, I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case in which the impugned FIR should be quashed. Keeping the case pending will not serve the ends of justice. The quashing of the FIR will provide the parties to this petition an opportunity to live in an amicable, peaceful and harmonious atmosphere which is not only in the interest of the parties but also for their families and ultimately the society at large.

For the reasons as discussed above, the instant petition is allowed and impugned FIR No.81 dated 27.12.2016 (Annexure P-1), registered for offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 506 read with

consequential proceedings arising therefrom, qua petitioners, is quashed.

July 11, 2018

Sachin M.

**(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No