

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

(1)

Crl. Misc. No. M-8203 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: August 13, 2018

Jagpal Singh and others

..... PETITIONERS

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....RESPONDENTS

(2)

Crl. Misc. No.M-7956 of 2018 (O&M)

Jagpal Singh @ Jajji and others

..... PETITIONERS

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURINDER GUPTA

Present: Mr. S.C. Arora , Advocate
for the petitioners in both the petitions.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar, D.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Kuldeep Sanwal, Advocate for
respondent No.2-complainant
in both the petitions.

SURINDER GUPTA, J(Oral)

This order will dispose of both the aforementioned petitions
filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (for short,
'Cr.P.C.').

An FIR No. 177 dated 01.09.2017 was registered at Police
Station City Muktsar Sahib for the offences punishable under Sections 447,

511, 506, 379, 148 read with Section 149 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and 25, 27 of Arms Act and another FIR No. 250 dated 19.12.2017 for the offences under Sections 307, 452, 323, 427, 506 IPC and 25, 27 of Arms Act was registered at same police station on the statement of Hardeep Singh @ Beeta-respondent No. 2 (in both the petitions). Both the parties have sought of quashing of the FIRs on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that first FIR bearing No. 177 dated 01.09.2017 was registered in connection with the land dispute between the parties. Second FIR bearing No. 250 dated 19.12.2017 was also with regard to the land dispute. Though, allegations were levelled that Jagmohan Singh @ Mohini-petitioner No. 2 (in CRM-M-7956-2018) had fired two shots towards the complainant but no injury was caused.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

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

Learned counsel for the parties submit that the parties are closely related to each other and the dispute between them has since been settled due to intervention of relatives vide compromise dated 08.02.2018, Annexure P-2 (CRM-M-8203-2018 and CRM-M-7956-2018). It has also been stated that now both the parties are having no objection if both the FIRs, along with consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

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 30.03.2018 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, both the aforementioned petitions are allowed and the FIR No. 177 dated 01.09.2017 and FIR No. 250 dated 19.12.2017 registered at Police Station City Muktsar Sahib along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

August 13, 2018
Jyoti-II

(SURINDER GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No