

123

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

CRM-M-10119-2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 22.12.2020

Kuljit Singh Dhani

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH

Present:- Mr. Jasraj Singh, Advocate, for the applicant/petitioner.

Mr. Amar Ashok Pathak, AAG, Punjab

Mr. H.S.Randhawa, Advocate,

for the complainant/respondent no.2.

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

CRM-29134-2020

By this application, advancement of the date of hearing in the accompanying petition is sought by the applicant/petitioner, on the ground that matter has been compromised between the parties and the statements of the parties also stands recorded in compliance of the order of this court dated 29.10.2019.

Notice in the application, with Mr.Ashok Kumar Pathak, AAG, Punjab, accepting notice at the asking of the court on behalf of respondent State and Mr. H.S.Randhawa, Advocate, accepting notice on behalf of respondent no.2/complainant. They do not oppose the allowing of this application.

Consequently, this application is allowed with the date of hearing in the accompanying petition advanced to today itself with the consent of the parties.

CRM-M-10119-2019

By this petition, the petitioner seeks quashing, on the basis of a compromise arrived at between the petitioner and respondent no.2, of FIR No.135, dated 14.11.2010, registered at Police Station Bullowal, District Hoshiarpur, alleging therein the commission of the offences punishable under Sections 323, 324, 452, 506, 148 and 149 of the IPC, as also all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Pursuant to the order of this Court dated 29.10.2019, the report of the learned JMIC, Hoshiarpur, dated 29.11.2019, is on record, stating to the effect that the complainant in the FIR, i.e. respondent no.2 herein (Joginder Singh), had appeared before that court and stated that he had entered into a compromise with the petitioner, with it further stated in the report that there was no other person injured in the occurrence (whose consent may be required before the FIR can be quashed if this court come to the conclusion that it can be so quashed).

Though that court has not given its own assessment as to whether the statement was made voluntarily by respondent no.2, however, Mr. H.S. Randhawa, Advocate, appears for respondent no.2 and does not deny the factum of the compromise reached, even before this court.

That being so, without making any comment on the actual merits of this court, looking at the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, and the fact that the matter has been compromised between the petitioner and the complainant (respondent no.2), the present petition is allowed and FIR No.135, dated 14.11.2010, registered at Police

Station Bullowal, District Hoshiarpur, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 323, 324, 452, 506, 148 and 149 of the IPC, along with all proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby quashed.

December 22, 2020
dharamvir/

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : YES/NO
Whether Reportable : YES/NO