

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

127

CRM-M-12270-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 24.03.2022

BINTU KUMAR ALIAS BUNTI AND ORS

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Lalit Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ashok Singh Chaudhary Addl. AG Haryana.

Mr. Rishi Nijhawan, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

Through this petition, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.0315 dated 17.11.2020 (Annexure P-1), registered under Sections 341, 392 IPC; Section 25/54 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Sections 341, 395, 397, 120-B (added) and Section 392 IPC (deleted later on), at Police station Kaithal Sadar, District Kaithal, along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 28.02.2022 (Annexure P-3), arrived at between the parties.

The present FIR was registered on the complaint of respondent No.2, namely, Anil Kumar, stating that on 16.11.2020 at about 7:30 p.m., he after collecting cash amount of Rs.10,00,000/- from his relative Vijay Goyal, was travelling back to his house in a car bearing

No.PB-13-AQ-7416, driven by his driver, namely, Bintu Kumar @ Bunti

(petitioner No.1). At about 8:00 p.m. when they reach near Parvati Brick kiln, Village Baba Ladana, District Kaithal, then one white colour Brezza Car came from behind and the driver of the said car stopped the same in front of the car of the complainant; that three boys came out of the said car; that two boys, who were having revolvers in their hands, pointed the same upon the complainant, snatched the cash amount and sped away in their car.

Initially the FIR was registered against the petitioner only and later on, the other accused were also apprehended. The nature of the offence committed by the petitioner along with the other accused is serious in nature, especially when the petitioner was the driver of the complainant and the offence committed by him has shaken the fiduciary relationship between master and servant.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 are the residents of same Village.

Be that as it may. Keeping in view the gravity and seriousness of the offence, this Court is not inclined to quash the FIR, on the basis on the compromise.

Faced with the situation, learned counsel for the petitioners prays for withdrawal of the present petition.

Dismissed as withdrawn.

A copy of this order be sent to the learned trial Court.

24.03.2022

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : *Yes/No*

Whether reportable : *Yes/No*