

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

CRM-M-2276 of 2021

Date of decision:27.1.2021

Dinesh @ Mehshi and others

... Petitioners

versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMOL RATTAN SINGH.

Present: Ms.Meena Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioners

...

AMOL RATTAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Case heard via video conferencing.

Though on 25.1.2021, upon learned counsel for the petitioners having stated that the matter has been compromised between the parties and even a decree of divorce under the provisions of Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, has been granted to the complainant-respondent no.2 and her husband, however, upon that order coming up for signing it was pointed out that in fact the complainant, Nirmal, is not a signatory to the compromise deed dated 16.6.2020, with even petitioner no.1 not seen to be a signatory thereto.

Consequently, counsel for the petitioners was called to court today, i.e. 27.1.2021, and the aforesaid fact was pointed out to her.

Learned counsel wishes to place on record the divorce decree to show that it was a condition of that decree that all cases would be withdrawn.

Even if that is so, if any FIR is to be quashed on the basis of

any compromise reached between the parties, the parties therein would need to be shown to be signatories to that compromise deed, which is not so in the present case.

Hence, this petition is dismissed with liberty to file a similar one, giving proper particulars therein.

27.1.2021
pk

(AMOL RATTAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No