

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.38967 of 2019
Reserved on: 05.08.2022
Pronounced on: 22.09.2022

Parveen Kashyap and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA**

Present: Ms. Sapan Seth, Advocate for the petitioners.

 Mr. Anmol Malik, DAG, Haryana.

 Mr. Navdeep Kalair, Advocate,
 for respondent No.3.

ANOOP CHITKARA J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
73	08.02.2019	City Fatehabad, District Fatehabad.	120-B, 406, 420 IPC and Sections 4, 5 and 6 of Prize Chits and Money Circulation Schemes (Banning) Act

The petitioners, arraigned as accused in the above captioned FIR, have come up before this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the FIR and all consequential proceedings based on the compromise with the aggrieved persons.

2. During the pendency of the petition, the accused and the aggrieved persons have compromised the matter, and its copy is annexed with this petition as Annexure P-2.
3. After that, the petitioners came up before this Court to quash the FIR, and in the quashing petition, impleading the aggrieved person as respondent.
4. On 10.12.2019, the aggrieved persons Vinod and Rajender Kumar (R-3) appeared before the CJM, Fatehabad and stated that there would be no objection if the court quashes this FIR and consequent proceedings. As per the concerned court's report dated 15.01.2020, although the parties consented to quashing of FIR, the investigating officer has pointed out

that there are other aggrieved persons who have not been made party to the compromise.

ANALYSIS & REASONING:

5. The petitioners did not arraign Sunil, Tony Verma, Shamsheer, Mayank Gupta and Rajesh Kumar as respondents in this case.
6. Since all the victims did not state about their no objection to the compromise and also the reasons which led to the compromise, as such this court cannot proceed further in this matter.
7. Given above, the petition is dismissed. However, liberty is reserved to the petitioners to file a fresh petition and there would be no necessity re-examine the aggrieved already examined and the accused, whose statements stand recorded. The copies of the statements alongwith report would suffice.

Petition dismissed in the terms mentioned above, with liberty reserved.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

22.09.2022
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.