

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

265

1. CRM-M-19161-2019

Date of Decision : 30.01.2020

Jassa Singh @ Amrik Singh and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

2. CRM-M-19072-2019

Date of Decision : 30.01.2020

Virsa Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN KUMAR TYAGI

Present : Mr. Amardeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M-19161-2019
and for the respondents No. 2 to 4 in CRM-M-19072-2019.

Mr. Arun Kaundal, D.A.G., Punjab
for respondent No. 1 in both the cases.

Mr. Lovepreet Handa, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 and 3 in CRM-M-19161-2019 and
for the petitioners in CRM-M-19072-2019.

ARUN KUMAR TYAGI, J. (ORAL)

1. This order disposes of **CRM-M-19161-2019** titled as **Jassa Singh alias Amrik Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others** and **CRM-M-19072-2019** titled as **Virsa Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others** as the same have arisen out of cross cases and involve common question

of facts and law.

2. **CRM-M-19161-2019** titled as **Jassa Singh alias Amrik Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others** has been filed by petitioners- **Jassa Singh @ Amrik Singh, Kamaljit Singh, Ranjit Singh, Baldev Singh, Balvir Singh, Lovepreet Singh @ Love and Major Singh** under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (for short 'the Cr.P.C.') for quashing of **FIR No.292 dated 16.11.2013** registered under Sections 307, 452, 323, 379, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short 'the IPC') and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sadar, District Ferozepur along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 13.12.2018 with complainants-**Virsa Singh and Lakhwinder Singh**, while **CRM-M-19072-2019** titled as **Virsa Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others** has been filed by petitioners - **Virsa Singh, Lakhwinder Singh, Milkha Singh, Gurdeep Singh, Jagdeep Singh @ Deepu, Anoop Singh, Baggar Singh @ Pipal** under Section 482 of the the Cr.P.C. for quashing of **DDR No.24 dated 16.11.2013** registered under Sections 341, 324, 323, 427, 148 and 149 of the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sadar, District Ferozepur as cross case to above referred FIR along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 13.12.2018 with complainants-**Kamaljit Singh, Baldev Singh and Balvir Singh**.

3. **FIR No. 292 dated 16.11.2013** was registered on statement of complainant- **Virsa Singh** who alleged that on 15.11.2013 when he alongwith his son **Jagpreet Singh** was sitting outside his house then at about 08.30 P.M. three tractor-trolleys, which were filled with graver and were playing loud music came there for passing in front of his house. Earlier, also on many occasions they used

to pass from there by playing loud music and were told number of times for not doing so. On being asked for not playing music in high volume, the drivers of tractor-trolleys stopped their vehicles in front of his house and ran away from there. After some time, Jassa Singh and Kamaljit Singh armed with revolver, Ranjit Singh armed with *kapa*, Baldev Singh armed with rod, Balvir Singh empty handed and Major Singh armed with baseball bat alongwith 5-6 unknown persons who were also armed with *kappa* and baseball bats came there in three cars. All of them alighted from their vehicles and came towards him. Due to fear, he ran towards his house and when he reached the courtyard, Ranjit Singh gave *kappa* blow on the back side of his head, Baldev Singh gave rod blow which hit on his left arm. Son of Jassa Singh gave baseball bat blow which hit on his left shoulder. When he tried to enter his room then Jassa Singh fired shot with his gun which hit him on his left feet. He fell down and his wife Ranjit Kaur raised alarm. His nephew Lakhwinder Singh came to save him and then Kamaljit Singh fired shot with his revolver which hit Lakhwinder Singh on his left thumb. Lakhwinder Singh tried to escape through stairs, then Major Singh gave him baseball bat blow which hit Lakhwinder Singh on his left shoulder. His brother Gurdeep Singh, Bhajan Singh and other relatives came at the spot and on seeing them all the accused persons fled from the spot.

4. **DDR No.24 dated 16.11.2013** was registered as cross case to above referred FIR on statement of complainant-**Kamaljit Singh** who has stated that his brother has a brick kiln near village Bahadarwala and used to bring wooden husk at the brick kiln. On 15.11.2013, he, his brother Ranjit Singh and their servant Faru were taking their three tractors towards his brick kiln. At about 8.30 p.m. they reached near the farm house of Virsa Singh, who alongwith his 10 companions was consuming liquor. Virsa Singh came in front of his tractor and

started abusing him. Virsa Singh armed with gun, Deepu Singh armed with *kapa*, Lakhwinder Singh armed with *kirpan*, Gurdeep Singh armed with *dang* and their labourers Anoop and Baggar armed with *dang* damaged lights and bonnet of their tractors. Virsa Singh raised *lalkara* to catch hold of him (complainant-Kamaljit Singh) and his companions. Lakhwinder Singh gave *kirpan* blow from reverse side which hit on right side of his forehead. Milkha Singh gave *kirpan* blow from reverse side which hit on his eyes. Gurdeep Singh gave *dang* blow to him which hit on his right shoulder. Anoop Singh gave *dang* blow on his left arm. Baggar gave *dang* blow which hit on his right hand. Lakhwinder Singh and Milkha Singh started beating his brother Ranjit Singh. Virsa Singh and Gurdeep Singh brought him (complainant-Kamaljit Singh) down from tractor and tried to take him inside their kothi. Their labourers Anoop and Baggar also caused injuries to him (complainant-Kamaljit Singh). He received injuries on fingers of his hand, palm of right hand, on his back and on his left thigh. When he and his brother raised alarm, then Balvir Singh and Baldev Singh, who live nearby, came to rescue them and the accused persons also caused injuries to them. In the meantime, Satnam Singh, who is accountant at his brick kiln came there and he arranged conveyance and got them admitted at Civil Hospital, Ferozepur.

5. The petitions were filed for quashing of the FIR and DDR on the grounds that now with the intervention of respectables, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties.

6. The Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, while issuing notice of motion in both the aforesaid cases on **29.04.2019**, directed the parties to appear before the Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate on **21.05.2019** or any other date convenient to the Court for recording their statements with regard to compromise and the Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was directed to send report along with statements of the

parties with regard to validity or otherwise of the compromise effected between the parties and also intimate whether any criminal proceedings are pending against either of the parties or not before the next date of hearing i.e. 31.07.2019.

7. In terms of aforesaid order, learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ferozepur recorded the statements of the parties and submitted report dated 12.06.2019 in **CRM-M-19161-2019** the relevant part of which reads as under:-

“ Respondents/complainants namely Virsa Singh son of Darshan Singh and Lakhwinder Singh son of Milkha Singh, both residents of Village Padri, District Ferozepur suffered joint statement that they have effected compromise with the petitioners/accused namely Amrik Singh alias Jassa son of Amarjit Singh; Kamaljit Singh son of Amarjit Singh; Ranjit Singh son of Amarjit Singh, all residents of village Bhagwanpura, Tehsil and District Ferozepur; Baldev Singh son of Bakhshish Singh; Balvir Singh son of Bakhshish Singh, both residents of Village Bahadarwala, Tehsil and District Ferozepur; Lovepreet Singh alias Love son of Jassa Singh and Major Singh son of Bhag Singh, both residents of Village Bhagwanpura, Tehsil and District Ferozepur in FIR No.292 dated 16.11.2013 under Sections 307, 452, 323, 379, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, PS Sadar, Ferozepur voluntarily with the intervention of respectables of locality without any inducement, threat, pressure or coercion. They further stated no other case is pending between them in any otherr court except the present FIR and that they have no objection if the present FIR is quashed. They have placed on record copies of their Adhar Cards and have also been identified by Sh. Gaurav Vohra, Advocate.

3. *Accused/petitioners namely Kamaljit Singh son of Amarjit Singh; Ranjit Singh son of Amarjit Singh, both residents of Village Bhagwanpura, Tehsil and District Ferozepur; Baldev Singh son of*

Bakhshish Singh; Balvir Singh son of Bakhshish Singh, both residents of Village Bahadarwala, Tehsil and District Ferozepur; Lovepreet Singh alias Love son of Jassa Singh and Major Singh son of Bhag Singh, both residents of Village Bhagwanpura, Tehsil and District Ferozepur also suffered joint statement to the effect that they have effected compromise with complainants/respondents namely Virsa Singh son of Darshan Singh and Lakhwinder Singh son of Milkha Singh, both residents of Village Padri, District Ferozepur in FIR No.292 dated 16.11.2013 under Sections 307,452,323,379,148,149 IPC and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, PS Sadar, Ferozepur voluntarily with the intervention of respectables of locality without any inducement, threat, pressure or coercion.”

8. In terms of aforesaid order, learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ferozepur recorded the statements of the parties and submitted report dated 12.06.2019 in **CRM-M-19072-2019** the relevant part of which reads as under:-

“ Respondents/complainants namely Kamaljit Singh son of Amarjit Singh, resident of Village Bhagwanpura, District Ferozepur; Baldev Singh son of Bakhshish Singh and Balvir Singh son of Bakhshish Singh, both residents of Village Bhadarwala, Tehsil and District Ferozepur suffered joint statement that they have effected compromise with the petitioners/accused namely Virsa Singh son of Darshan Singh; Lakhwinder Singh son of Milkha Singh; Milkha Singh son of Darshan Singh; Gurdeep Singh son of Darshan Singh; Jagdeep Singh alias Deepu son of Virsa Singh; Anoop Singh son of Bhajan Singh, all residents of Village Padri, Tehsil and District Ferozepur; Baggar Singh alias Pippal Singh son of Murad, resident of Village Jhok Tehal Singh, presently Basti Guru Karam Singh, Guruharsahai, District Ferozepur in DDR No. 24 dated 16.11.2013 under Sections 341, 324, 323, 427, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 27/54/59 of Arms Act in FIR No. 292 dated 16.11.2013

under Sections 307, 452, 323, 379, 148, 149 IPC and Section 25/27 of Arms Act, PS Sadar, Ferozepur voluntarily with the intervention of respectables of locality without any inducement, threat, pressure or coercion. They further stated that no other case is pending between them in any other court except the present FIR and that they have no objection if the present FIR is quashed. They have placed on record copies of their Adhar Cards and have also been identified by Sh. Parul Kapoor, Advocate.

3. *Accused/petitioners namely Virsa Singh son of Darshan Singh; Lakhwinder Singh son of Milkha Singh; Milkha Singh son of Darshan Singh; Gurdeep Singh son of Darshan Singh; Jagdeep Singh alias Deepu son of Virsa Singh; Anoop Singh son of Bhajan Singh, all residents of Village Padri, Tehsil and District Ferozepur; Baggar Singh alias Pippal Singh son of Murad, resident of Village Jhok Tehal Singh, presently Basti Guru Karam Singh, Guruharsahai, District Ferozepur also suffered joint statement to the effect that they have effected compromise with complainants/respondents namely Kamaljit Singh son of Amarjit Singh, resident of Village Bhagwanpura, District Ferozepur; Baldev Singh son of Bakhshish Singh and Balvir Singh son of Bakhshish Singh, both residents of Village Bhadarwala, Tehsil and District Ferozepur in DDR No. 24 dated 16.11.2013 under Sections 341, 324, 323, 427, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 27/54/59 of Arms Act in FIR No. 292 dated 16.11.2013 under Sections 307, 452, 323, 379, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, PS Sadar, Ferozepur voluntarily with the intervention of respectables of locality without any inducement, threat, pressure or coercion. They stated that no other case is pending between them in any other court except the present FIR. They have placed on record copies of their Adhar Cards and have also been identified by Sh. Gaurav Vohra, Advocate.*
4. *From the aforesaid statements, it is concluded that the statements of the parties are bonafide and are not result of any pressure or coercion etc. in any manner and that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine and valid*

and further that no other case is pending against either of the parties except the present FIR. ”

9. The Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, vide order dated 19.11.2019, ordered recording of statement of Jassa Singh @ Amrik Singh and in compliance thereof, learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ferozepur submitted report dated 16.12.2019, the relevant part of which reads as under:-

“ Petitioner/accused namely Jassa Singh alias Amrik Singh aged 52 years son of Amarjit Singh, resident of Village Bhagwanpura, Tehsil and District Ferozepur appeared and suffered statement to the effect that he has effected compromise with complainants/respondents namely Virsa Singh son of Darshan Singh and Lakhwinder Singh son of Milkha Singh, both residents of Village Padri, District Ferozepur in FIR No. 292 dated 16.11.2013 under Sections 307, 452, 323, 379, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25/27 of Arms Act, PS Sadar, Ferozepur voluntarily with the intervention of respectables of locality without any inducement, threat, pressure or coercion. He stated that no other case is pending between them in any other court except the present FIR. He has also placed on record copy of his Adhar Card and has also been identified by Sh. Mehar Singh, Advocate.

From the aforesaid statement of petitioner/accused namely Jassa Singh alias Amrik Singh recorded today and from the statements recorded earlier on 12.06.2019, it is concluded that the statements of the parties are bonafide and are not result of any pressure or coercion etc. in any manner and that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine and valid. It is further submitted that there is no other case pending between the parties in any other court except the present FIR. ”

10. State has not filed any reply to the petitions and learned State Counsel has submitted that the State has no objection in case the aforesaid FIR and DDR along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed

on the basis of the compromise effected between the parties.

11. I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioners, learned State Counsel and gone through the relevant record.

12. In *State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (Supreme Court) : 2019 (2) RCR (Criminal) 255*, Hon'ble three Judge Bench of the Supreme Court, while deciding the reference made in view of the apparent conflict between the two decisions of Hon'ble Supreme Court in the cases of *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab 2014(2) R.C.R.(Criminal) 482 : (2014) 6 SCC 466* and *State of Rajasthan v. Shambhu Kewat, 2014(1) R.C.R.(Criminal) 199 : (2014) 4 SCC 149*, observed as under:-

"12. Now so far as the conflict between the decisions of this Court in the cases of Narinder Singh (supra) and Shambhu Kewat (supra) is concerned, in the case of Shambhu Kewat (supra), this Court has noted the difference between the power of compounding of offences conferred on a court under Section 320 Cr.P.C., 1973 and the powers conferred under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 for quashing of criminal proceedings by the High Court. In the said decision, this Court further observed that in compounding the offences, the power of a criminal court is circumscribed by the provisions contained in Section 320 Cr.P.C., 1973 and the court is guided solely and squarely thereby, while, on the other hand, the formation of opinion by the High Court for quashing a criminal proceedings or criminal complaint under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 is guided by the material on record as to whether ends of justice would justify such exercise of power, although ultimate consequence may be acquittal or dismissal of indictment. However, in the subsequent decision in the case of Narinder Singh (supra), the very Bench ultimately concluded in paragraph 29 as under:

"29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1. Power conferred under section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and

with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

- (i) ends of justice, or*
- (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.*

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.

29.6. Offences under section 307 IPC would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore are to be generally treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to proving the charge under section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delegate parts of the body, nature of weapons used, etc. Medical report in respect of injuries suffered by the victim can generally be the guiding factor. On the basis of this prima facie analysis, the High Court can examine as to whether there is a strong possibility of conviction or the chances of conviction are remote and bleak. In the former case it can refuse to accept the settlement and quash the criminal proceedings whereas in the latter case it would be permissible for the High Court to accept the plea compounding the offence based on complete settlement between the parties. At this stage, the Court can also be swayed by the fact that the settlement between the parties is going to result in harmony between them which may improve their future relationship.

29.7. While deciding whether to exercise its power under section 482 of the Code or not, timings of settlement play a crucial role. Those cases where the settlement is arrived at immediately after the alleged commission of offence and the matter is still under investigation, the High Court may be liberal in accepting the settlement to quash the criminal proceedings/investigation. It is because of the reason that at this stage the investigation is still on and even the charge-sheet has not been filed. Likewise, those cases where the charge is framed but the evidence is yet to start or the evidence is still at infancy stage, the High Court can show benevolence in exercising its powers favourably, but after prima facie assessment of the circumstances/material mentioned above. On the other hand, where the prosecution evidence is almost complete or after the conclusion of the evidence the matter is at the stage of argument, normally the High Court should refrain from exercising its power under section 482 of the Code, as in such cases the trial court would be in a position to decide the case finally on merits and to come to a conclusion as to whether the offence under section 307 IPC is committed or not. Similarly, in those cases where the conviction is already recorded by the trial court and the matter is at the appellate stage before the High Court, mere compromise between the parties would not be a ground to accept the same resulting in acquittal of the offender who has already been convicted by the trial court. Here charge is proved under section 307 IPC and conviction is already recorded of a heinous crime and, therefore, there is no question of sparing a convict found guilty of such a crime."

13. Considering the law on the point and the other decisions of this Court on the point, referred to hereinabove, it is observed and held as under:

- i) that the power conferred under section 482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings for the non-compoundable offences under Section 320 of the Code can be exercised having overwhelmingly and predominantly the civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes and when the parties have resolved the entire dispute amongst themselves;
- ii) such power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involved heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society;
- iii) similarly, such power is not to be exercised for the offences under the special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender;
- iv) offences under section 307 IPC and the Arms Act etc. would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore are to be treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone, and therefore, the criminal proceedings for the offence under section 307 IPC and/or the Arms Act etc. which have

a serious impact on the society cannot be quashed in exercise of powers under section 482 of the Code, on the ground that the parties have resolved their entire dispute amongst themselves. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to framing the charge under section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delegate parts of the body, nature of weapons used etc. However, such an exercise by the High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and the charge sheet is filed/charge is framed and/or during the trial. Such exercise is not permissible when the matter is still under investigation. Therefore, the ultimate conclusion in paragraphs 29.6 and 29.7 of the decision of this Court in the case of Narinder Singh (supra) should be read harmoniously and to be read as a whole and in the circumstances stated hereinabove;

v) while exercising the power under section 482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings in respect of non-compoundable offences, which are private in nature and do not have a serious impact on society, on the ground that there is a settlement/compromise between the victim and the offender, the High Court is required to consider the antecedents of the accused; the conduct of the accused, namely, whether the accused was absconding and why he was absconding, how he had managed with the complainant to enter into a compromise etc.”

13. In FIR No. 292 dated 16.11.2013 registered on statement of Virsa Singh it was stated that when Virsa Singh tried to enter his room then Jassa Singh fired shot with his gun which hit him on his left feet and that when his nephew Lakhwinder Singh came to save him then Kamaljit Singh fired shot with his revolver which hit Lakhwinder Singh on his left thumb. As per medical opinion obtained by the police on the basis of FSL report no fire arm injury was found to have been caused to Virsa Singh and Lakhwinder Singh and on completion of investigation the police accordingly filed cancellation report in view of the compromise between the parties while mentioning that no case under Section 307 of the IPC was made out.

14. In the facts and circumstances of the case, it is evident that Section

307 of the IPC was incorporated just for the sake of making out a case of commission of heinous offence without any substantive evidence regarding commission thereof. In such an eventuality, quashing of FIR and consequential proceedings in respect of offence under Section 307 of the IPC was held to be permissible in *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab 2014(2) R.C.R.(Criminal) 482* and *State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (Supreme Court) : 2019 (2) RCR (Criminal) 255,*

15. A perusal of the reports of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Ferozepur clearly shows that the matter has been compromised by the parties with their free consent, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. The occurrence allegedly took place due to dispute over the passage/playing of loud music. The parties have resolved their entire dispute among themselves. The compromise has been arrived at between the parties at the initial stage and the compromise will restore cordial relations between the parties and will contribute to peace and harmony in the society.

16. In view of the facts and circumstances of the case, the possibility of conviction of the petitioners in both the cases arising out of above said FIR and DDR is remote and bleak. Continuation of the criminal cases against the petitioners in both the cases will put the petitioners to great oppression and extreme injustice would be caused to them if the above said FIR and DDR and all consequential proceedings are not quashed.

17. In view of the above discussion, **FIR No.292 dated 16.11.2013** registered under Sections 307, 452, 323, 379, 148 and 149 of the IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police Station Sadar, District Ferozepur and **DDR No.24 dated 16.11.2013** registered under Sections 341, 324, 323, 427, 148 and 149 of the IPC and Section 27 of the Arms Act, 1959 at Police

Station Sadar, District Ferozepur along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua all the petitioners named therein.

The petitions are allowed accordingly.

30.01.2020
Kavneet Singh

(ARUN KUMAR TYAGI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

:

Yes/No

Whether reportable

:

Yes/No