

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

CRM-M-12225-2023 (O&M)

Reserved on: 11.04.2023
Pronounced on: 24.04.2023

Manohar Lal alias Manohar Singh & others

...Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab & another

...Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Mr. Bhupinder K. Bhangu, Advocate
 for the petitioner(s).

 Mr. IPS Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

 Mr. Navneet Singh Sangwan, Advocate
 for respondent no.2.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J. (Oral)

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
101	18.7.2017	Sadar Kapurthala	420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 474, 120-B IPC and 13A of Punjab Village Common Land Regulation Act, 1961

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

- During the pendency of the petition, the accused and the aggrieved person have compromised the matter, and its copy is annexed with this petition as Annexure P-2.
- After that, the petitioner came up before this Court to quash the FIR, and in the quashing petition, impleading the aggrieved person as respondent.
- This court had asked the parties to appear before the concerned court and had asked the said court to give its report as per the format. The report reads as follows:

Name of the reporting Court	JMIC, Kapurthala
------------------------------------	------------------

Criminal Case no. before trial Court	CHI-364-2018
---	--------------

1.	Names of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s)	Sukjitpal Singh
2.	Dates on which the statement(s) of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s) were recorded	23.3.2023
3.	Has the identity of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s) been verified?	Yes
4.	Whether all the victims/ all the aggrieved persons have compromised the matter?	Yes
5.	Is there pressure, threat, or coercion upon the victim(s)/aggrieved person(s)/complainant?	No
6.	Names of the accused person(s)	1. Manohar Lal @ Manohar Singh; 2. Vijay Kumar; 3. Sarabjit Lal.
7.	Dates on which the statement(s) of the accused persons(s) recorded	23.3.2023
8.	Whether all the accused have compromised the matter? If no, then the names of the accused who have compromised.	No. The accused namely Manohar Lal @ Manohar Singh, Vijay Kumar and Sarbjit Lal.
9.	Whether proclamation proceedings are pending against any accused?	Yes
10.	Has the police report been filed or not?	Yes
11.	Notice of accusation /Charges have been framed or not?	Yes
12.	Sections of statutes invoked in the matter	420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 474, 120-B IPC and 13A of Punjab Village Common Land Regulation Act, 1961
13.	Whether the court is satisfied with the genuineness of the compromise?	Yes.

ANALYSIS & REASONING:

5. A close scrutiny of the FIR reveals that the petitioners did not arraign all the victims/aggrieved persons, as a respondent 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

complainant/aggrieved persons and the accused, whose statements stand recorded.
The copies of the statements along with report would suffice.

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

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

April 24, 2023
AK

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No