

CRM-M-51628-2021

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51628-2021
Reserved on: 04.02.2022
Pronounced on: 09.02.2022

Joginder Singh and others ...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Karanjeet Singh Brar, Advocate
For the petitioner(s).

Mr. H.S. Sitta, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rajat Dogra, Advocate for the complainant.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
0023	01.04.2021	Mamdot, District Ferozepur	336, 341. 148 & 149 IPC and Sections 25 & 27 of Arms Act

The petitioner(s), arraigned as accused in the above captioned FIR, have come up before this Court under Section 482 CrPC for quashing of the FIR and all consequential proceedings based on the compromise with the victim(s).

2. The gist of the allegations against the petitioner(s) is that the complainant (respondent No.2) made a statement before the police and on that statement, the police registered the FIR captioned above. Needless to mention all the details as the parties have entered into an out of Court compromise.
3. During the pendency of the petition, the accused and the victim(s) have compromised the matter, and its copy is annexed with this petition. After that, the petitioner(s) came up before this Court to quash the FIR, and in the quashing petition, the complainant has been impleaded as respondent(s).
4. On the prayer of the parties in the present petition, the Court had permitted the parties to appear before the concerned Court to record their statements. As per the concerned Court's report, the complainant, without any threat, consented to the quashing of FIR and consequent proceedings.
5. One of the accused (petitioner No.5) –Sarabjeet Singh is a juvenile, just aged 17

CRM-M-51628-2021

years and another accused (petitioner No.1)-Joginder Singh is aged about 60 years. Both the parties are residents of the same village and due to intervention of the villagers their animosity has been removed. As per the compromise (Annexure P-2) the parties have compromised for better future and with assurances that their family members will neither fight with each other nor repeat past incidents. Even they have bounded themselves in case of default. It shows that the parties are genuinely concerned about their future and have buried their past criminal action.

6. Considering the entire facts, compromise, and in the light of the above-mentioned facts, I believe that continuing these proceedings will not suffice any fruitful purpose whatsoever. In the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the Court invokes the inherent jurisdiction under section 482 CrPC and quashes the FIR and all subsequent proceedings qua the petitioner(s). The bail bonds of the petitioner(s) are accordingly discharged. All pending application(s), if any, stand closed.

Petition allowed in the terms mentioned above.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

February 09, 2022
anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes
Whether reportable: No.