

112 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Decided on : 11.01.2023

CRM-M-30681-2022

Sanjeev and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CRM-M-30698-2022

Aakash @ Ashu Yadav

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANJARI NEHRU KAUL

Present : Mr. Manu Sachdeva, Advocate for
Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Parveen Kumar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Manjari Nehru Kaul, J.(Oral)

This order shall dispose of criminal petitions i.e. CRM-M
Nos.30681 and 30698 of 2022 as both of them have arisen out of same FIR.
Brief facts of the case are taken from CRM-M-30681-2022.

Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.PC for
quashing the FIR No.256 dated 21.06.2022 under Sections 148, 149, 307
IPC and Sections 25(1)(a) of Arms Act, 1959 (Sections 323, 506 and 379-B
IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Khedki Daula District

Gurugram and consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 11.07.2022 (Annexure P-4).

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that subsequent to the lodging of FIR in question, parties have amicably resolved their dispute and decided to put to rest the criminal case pending between the parties. Learned counsel further submits that in the circumstances, continuation of criminal proceedings would be a futile exercise. In support of his submissions, learned counsel has placed reliance on the judgment of Coordinate Benches of this Court passed in CRM-M-50424-2019 titled as Gursartaj Singh @ Robin and others vs. State of Punjab and others (decided on 22.07.2022) and CRM-M-10858-2021 titled as Jagjit Singh @ Jubi and others vs. State of Punjab and others (decided on 29.04.2022).

Learned counsel appearing for the complainant does not dispute and oppose the submissions made by counsel opposite and submits that compromise has indeed been effected between the parties subsequent to the registration of FIR in question and FIR be thus, quashed.

Learned State counsel has, however, strongly opposed the submissions made by counsel for the petitioners for quashing the FIR in question. It has been brought to the notice of this Court by the State counsel that the petitioners are men of criminal antecedents and number of cases are registered against them, which facts find duly incorporated in the affidavit dated 12.09.2022 filed by Assistant Commissioner of Police, Manesar, Gurugram. It has also been submitted that the complainant is not the only aggrieved party in the instant case as there are three other persons, who received injuries at the hands of the petitioners who were all armed with

lethal weapons.

After arguing for sometime, when this Court was not inclined to quash the FIR in question, more so, in the wake of criminal antecedents of the petitioners and material concealment qua the same in the petition, a prayer for withdrawal of the instant petition has been made by the counsel for the petitioners.

The present petition(s) stands dismissed as withdrawn. However, learned counsel for the petitioners is advised to be more conscious and truthful in future.

(MANJARI NEHRU KAUL)
JUDGE

11.01.2023
sonia

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable :	Yes/No