

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

254

**C.R.M-M No.23841-2018 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 01.04.2019**

Gurwinder Singh & anr.

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab & anr.

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE AJAY TEWARI

Present : Mr. J.S.Warring, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramandeep Sandhu, Senior DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. IS Dhaliwal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

AJAY TEWARI, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.72 dated 06.04.2018 under Section 379-B IPC at Police Station Kotwali Bathinda, District Bathinda and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise effected between the parties.

At the very outset learned State Counsel has argued that an offence under Section 379-B IPC should not be quashed on the basis of compromise not because it is particularly heinous offence but because its incident exploded and there is no city, town or village which is free from this urge. Every day there are news reports where people sometime have suffered injuries because of snatching. He further states that the challan has

Counsel for the petitioners has very fairly accepted that Section 379-B IPC has become very rampant but has argued that the petitioners are young boys and especially the petitioner No.2 has to go abroad and this FIR has been lodged as a result of some misunderstanding.

Be that as it may, in my considered opinion, the objection raised by the State counsel can not be ignored and therefore the FIR can not be quashed on the basis of compromise. However to protect the interest of the petitioners the trial Court is directed to expedite the hearing and after framing charge, ensure that respondent No.2-complainant is examined expeditiously.

Counsel for respondent No.2-complainant states that the complainant would not seek any adjournment to appear and give her testimony.

Learned State counsel has argued that the only non-official witness is the complainant and the prosecution will conclude its evidence within 3 months of charge being framed.

In the circumstances, the trial Court is directed to conclude the trial on or before 31.08.2019.

Petitions stands disposed of with the above said observations.

Since the main case has been decided, the pending criminal miscellaneous application, if any, also stands disposed of.

(**AJAY TEWARI**)
JUDGE

01.04.2019
pooja sharma-I

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