

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-1464-2021**

Date of Decision: September 19, 2022

Satnam Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Hakam Singh, AAG, Punjab,
for respondent No. 1- State.

None for respondent No. 2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J.

Present petition, under Section 482, Cr.P.C., has been filed by Satnam Singh, Harpreet Singh @ Happy, Jagpreet Singh @ Jagga and Sarabjit Kaur, for quashing of FIR No. 47, dated 21.04.2020 (Annexure P-1), for the offences punishable under Sections 326, 323, 324 and 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Ghuman, District Batala, and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 23.12.2020 (Annexure P-2).

Vide order dated 22.01.2021, private parties were directed to appear before Court of learned Area Magistrate/trial Court for the purpose of recording of their statements.

On 27.04.2021, on technical issue regarding appearance of counsel for the petitioners through video-conferencing as well as on

account of non-receipt of report, matter was adjourned.

On 26.08.2021, counsel for the petitioners informed that due to miscommunication from his office, statements of parties could not be recorded before the Court of learned Area Magistrate/trial Court. However, one more opportunity was granted and report was awaited.

Today, neither there is any representation on behalf of the petitioners nor on behalf of respondent No. 2.

Further, report forwarded to this Court, vide Memo. No. 175, dated 16.10.2021, by the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Batala, is available on record, which reveals that despite of issuing notice to both the parties to appear before the court upto 12.10.2021, none of the parties appeared.

From aforementioned orders; report received by this Court from learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Batala; and non-appearance of private parties or their counsel today, it becomes clear that no one is interested in pursuing the present petition. Rather, one after other opportunities were sought, but no interest is shown by either of the parties.

In these circumstances, no alternative is left with this Court, except to dismiss the present petition for want of prosecution.

Ordered accordingly.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 19, 2022

Pk Kapoor

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: **YES/NO**

Whether Reportable: **YES/NO**