

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

Decided on : 13.10.2021

CRM-M-15705-2018 (O&M)

Parshotam Lal Petitioner

Versus

Baljit Kaur Respondent

CRM-M-443-2018 (O&M)

Parshotam Lal Petitioner

versus

Baljit Kaur Respondent

CRM-M-852-2020 (O&M)

Parshotam Lal Petitioner

versus

Baljit Kaur & anr. Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Saurabh Kapoor, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Luvinder Sofat, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Anil Kumar Garg, Advocate
for the complainant.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

This order shall dispose of the abovementioned three criminal petitions as same have arisen out of same criminal complaint between the parties.

CRM-M-15705-2018 has been filed under Section 482 Cr.PC for quashing of criminal complaint No.164/1/12 dated 27.08.2011 under Sections 406/498-A/323/324/506 IPC and all the consequential proceedings

arising out of the same, on the basis of compromise arrived at, between the parties.

Vide order dated 20.04.2018 in CRM-M No.15705 of 2018 parties were directed to appear before the trial Court on 20.04.2018 to get their respective statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at, between them and the statement of the petitioner was recorded through special power of attorney i.e. through her sister. In CRM-M-15705-2018 and CRM-M-443-2018 petitioner withdrew the relief of quashing of criminal complaint and summoning order and confined his prayer to the quashment of order declaring him to be a proclaimed offender. Thereafter, in compliance of order dated 27.04.2021, the petitioner appeared and surrendered before the Court concerned on 09.08.2021.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present complaint has been filed on account of marital discord between the parties. However, subsequently the matter stood compromised amicably between the parties by compromise.

As per report dated 02.07.2018 from JMIC, Jalandhar, which has already been received compromise effected between the parties is without any pressure or coercion and out of their free will. The trial Court has annexed the photocopies of the statement of the parties alongwith its report.

Learned State counsel also submits that there are no other accused other than the petitioner and the respondent is the only aggrieved person in the FIR in question.

In view of the report of the learned JMIC, Jalandhar and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in *Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303*, and also by the Full Bench of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*, the instant petition(s) is allowed. The aforesaid criminal complaint along with all consequential proceedings arising out of them, are quashed.

Needless to say the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

13.10.2021
sonia

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No