

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

CRM-M No.22956 of 2019 (O&M)

Date of Decision: January 27, 2020

Sandeep @ Popat & another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana & another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ BAJAJ

Present: Mr. Ram Darshan Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Tanushree Gupta, DAG, Haryana.

Mr. Ajit Sharma, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

MANOJ BAJAJ, J.

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.283 dated 02.11.2018, under Sections 379-B read with Section 34 IPC, registered at Police Station, Bawal, District Rewari and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise dated 03.05.2019 (Annexure P-2).

As per the prosecution case, on the complaint of respondent No.2- Rohit Kumar, subject FIR was registered against the petitioners and one Nitesh containing allegations of snatching of ₹ 3040/- from him.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that on 03.05.2019, a compromise has been entered into between the petitioners and private respondent No.2 in the presence of respectables and relatives. He contends that the petitioners and respondent No.2 are close friends and belong to nearby villages and, thus, prayed for quashing of the subject FIR.

In response to the notice, reply by way of affidavit of Jai Singh, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Bawal, District Rewari on behalf of respondent No.1 has been filed, wherein it has been mentioned that the final report dated 30.01.2019 was filed and as many as six prosecution witnesses have been examined during the course of the trial. It has also been mentioned that the petition is not maintainable as quashing of non-compoundable offences on the basis of compromise has been sought and the 3rd co-accused Nitesh has not been impleaded as a party.

I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the parties and considering the advance stage of the trial, particularly the fact that the compromise is partial in nature, it will not be appropriate for this Court to accept the same for exercise of inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. Resultantly, no case is made out for invoking inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

Petition is dismissed.

January 27, 2020
ramesh

(MANOJ BAJAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No