

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

251

**CRM-M-13605-2021
Decided on : 14.03.2023**

JASSI AND OTHERS

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

PRESENT: None for the petitioners.

Mr. Dhruv Sihag, AAG, Haryana.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

Present petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.126, dated 09.05.2019, under Sections 120-B, 148, 149, 307 IPC and Section 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act, 1959 registered at Police Station Hassanpur, District Palwal and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise dated 16.03.2021 (Annexure P-2).

This Court had passed the following order on 24.03.2021:-

“Case heard via video conferencing.

By this petition, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR no.126 dated 9.5.2019, registered at Police Station Hassanpur, District Palwal, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 120-B/148/ 149/307 of the IPC and Sections 25/54/59 of the Arms Act, 1959, as also all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise arrived at between the petitioners and respondent no.2. A copy of the compromise deed has been annexed as Annexure P-2 with the petition.

Notice of motion.

Mr.Surender Singh, learned AAG, Haryana, accepts notice at

the asking of the court on behalf of respondent no.1 and other than relying upon the judgments of the Supreme Court in Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others, 2014(2) RCR (Criminal) 482 and State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan and others, 2019(2) RCR (Criminal) 255, submits that petitioner no.4 in fact has been absconding and as regards the other petitioners, the report under Section 173(2) of the Cr.P.C. has already been submitted, with the charges already framed by the trial court.

Mr. M. S. Rana, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.2.

He will file a power of attorney duly executed by respondent no.2 in his favour, well before the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 4.5.2021.

Learned counsel for the petitioners would address arguments in terms of the ratio of the aforesaid judgments.”

On 23.08.2021, the case was adjourned on request of learned counsel for the petitioners by observing that he would be required to address arguments in terms of the order dated 24.03.2021. However, on 19.09.2022, 15.11.2022 and 13.12.2022, none had appeared for the petitioners. Same is the position even today, despite the case having been called out twice.

In view of the above, it appears that the petitioners are not interested to pursue this case.

Dismissed.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

14.03.2023
Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No