

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

203

**CRM-M-34350-2020
Decided on : 02.11.2020**

Mukul Dhull and another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab

... Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

(Through Video Conferencing)

PRESENT: Mr. Parvinder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Rashmi Attri, AAG, Punjab
assisted by ASI Jaspal Singh.

Mr. Ramandeep Singh, Advocate
for the complainant.

MANJARI NEHRU KAUL, J. (Oral):

Prayer in the instant petition is for grant of regular bail to the petitioners in FIR No. 105, dated 14.07.2020, under Sections 406, 420, 465, 468, 471, 506, 120-B IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, registered at Police Station Sadar, Rupnagar, on account of compromise having been affected between the parties on 22nd September, 2020 (Annexure P-2).

At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners contends that subsequent to the registration of the FIR in question, the differences and misunderstandings between the parties have been sorted out and the alleged amount given by the complainant to the petitioners has been returned. In support of his contention, learned counsel has referred to Annexure P-2 which is a copy of the compromise dated 22.09.2020, arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners further contends that for quashing of the FIR in question, a petition bearing No.CRM-M-35248-2020, has been filed by the petitioners, wherein, the parties have been directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate to get their statements recorded with regard to the compromise so effected between the parties.

Mr. Ramandeep Singh, Advocate, for the complainant does not dispute the factum of compromise.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Jaspal Singh, submits that the alleged amount has been returned to the complainant.

Heard.

In view of the submissions made by learned counsel for the parties and keeping in view the fact that the matter has been compromised between the parties and the petitioners are in custody since 24th September, 2020, I deem it a fit case for grant of the concession of regular bail to the petitioner. The petition as such is allowed and the petitioner is admitted to bail to the satisfaction of trial Court/Duty Magistrate. However, it is made clear that anything observed hereinabove shall not be construed as an expression of opinion on the merits of the case.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

November 02, 2020

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No