

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

CRM-M-9051-2022 (O&M)

Date of decision: 07.07.2022

Ranjit Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. Arvind Kashyap, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Johny, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No. 98 dated 22.11.2013, registered under Sections 323, 324, 325, 148, 149 of the IPC at Police Station Mulepur, District Fatehgarh Sahib as well as for setting aside the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 04.09.2015, passed by the trial Court, vide which the petitioners were held guilty for commission of offence punishable under Sections 325, 324, 323, 341 read with Section 149 of the IPC and were sentenced to undergo maximum rigorous imprisonment for a period of two years and to pay a total fine of Rs.3000/- each with default clause.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have filed an appeal before the lower appellate Court, which is pending adjudication and in the meantime, a good sense prevailed between the parties as the petitioners as well as complainant Surjit Singh are the residents of the same village and in order to bring peace and harmony in the

families of both the sides, a valid compromise has been effected between the parties.

In pursuance to order dated 04.03.2022, the Additional District & Sessions Judge, Fatehgarh Sahib has submitted a report that complainant Surjit Singh, who is the only victim/injured in this case, has entered into a valid compromise with all the petitioners and the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any pressure or coercion. It is further stated that as per the statement of SI Gurpreet Singh, the compromise is valid.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has referred to a judgment rendered in *Sube Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and another, 2013 (4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 102*, wherein a Division Bench of this Court has held that even after the conviction, if the parties have settled the dispute amicably and have decided to live in peace and harmony, this Court, in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., can compound the offence.

Learned State counsel as well as learned counsel for respondent No. 2/complainant have not disputed the factual position and submitted that there is a valid compromise between the parties.

In view of above, considering the fact that the petitioners have been convicted only under Sections 325, 324, 323, 341 read with Section 149 of the IPC, this petition is allowed. Offences under 325, 324, 323, 341 read with Section 149 of the IPC are compounded and the sentence awarded to the petitioners is reduced to the sentence already undergone by them.

07.07.2022

Waseem Ansari

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE**

*Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable*

*Yes/No
Yes/No*