

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10450-2019

Date of Decision: 06.11.2019

**Maghu Ram and another**

**.....Petitioners**

**Vs.**

**State of Punjab and others**

**.....Respondents**

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH**

Present: Mr. H.S.Oberoi, Advocate,  
for the petitioners.

Mr. B.S. Sewak, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Arshdeep Singh, Advocate,  
for respondents no. 2 and 3.

\*\*\*\*\*

**AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)**

By this petition, quashing of FIR No. 286, dated 22.08.2015, is sought, as has been registered 'against the petitioners' at Police Station Phagwara City, District Kapurthala, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 324, 323, 148, 149 and 341 of the IPC read with Section 34 thereof, on the basis of a compromise arrived at between the petitioners (accused) and respondents no. 2 and 3.

Pursuant to the order dated 08.03.2019, the report of the learned SDJM, Phagwara, dated 28.05.2019, is on record, stating to the effect that the first petitioner, i.e. Meghu Ram, appeared for himself as also for petitioner no. 2 Amandeep @ Anil Kumar as the attorney of the latter (with petitioner no. 2 shown to be residing in Italy), and recorded their statements in respect of the compromise stated to have been reached between the parties.

More importantly, respondent 3 being the complainant in the FIR also appeared before that Court and recorded his statement to that effect.

As per the opinion of the learned Magistrate, the compromise reached between the parties is “genuine”.

It is to be specifically noticed that a cross-version to the occurrence is stated to have been registered 'within the same FIR itself', with there being no separate diary entry to that effect (or a separate FIR), as is not denied by any of the counsel, including the State counsel, on instructions from ASI Daya Chand, who is present in Court today to assist him.

That being so and it having been seen that the complainant, i.e. respondent no. 3, is the grand-son of the first petitioner, with respondent no. 2 being the son of the first petitioner, and as learned State counsel (on instructions from the aforesaid police official) submits that there is no other criminal case shown to be registered against the petitioners, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 286, dated 22.08.2015, registered against the petitioners at Police Station Phagwara City, District Kapurthala, alleging therein the commission of offences punishable under Sections 324, 323, 148, 149 and 341 of the IPC, read with Section 34 thereof, along with all proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby quashed, including the cross-version thereto recorded within the same FIR.

**November 06, 2019**  
nitin/dinesh

**(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)**  
**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned  
Whether Reportable

Yes  
No.