

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

CRM-M-54009-2022

Date of Decision: 24.05.2023

SUNNY GUPTA AND OTHERS

..Petitioners

Vs.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV BERRY

Present: Mr. G.S. Madaan, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Mohit Thakur, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. Bhupinder Gupta, Advocate for
Mr. Anshul Sharma, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SANJIV BERRY, J. (Oral)

This is a petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, for quashing of FIR No. 100 dated 21.07.2020 under Sections 336, 160, 120-B IPC (offences under Section 307 IPC and 25 of the Arms Act was deleted from the present FIR vide DDR No. 28 dated 21.08.2020 by the IO) 27, 54 59 of the Arms Act and Section 3 of the Epidemic Diseases Act, 1897 and Section 51 of the Disaster Management Act 1897 registered at Police Station Satnampura, Phagwara (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 14.10.2022 (Annexure P-2) executed between the parties.

[2]. With the intervention of respectables and elderly people of the society, the parties have arrived at a settlement vide compromise dated 14.10.2022 (Annexure P-2), which is duly signed by them. The matter was referred to the Court below for recording of statements of the parties and to report with respect to genuineness of the compromise arrived at between the parties. The District and Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, vide report dated 22.05.2023, has apprised this Court that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure.

[3]. Respondent No. 2 is represented by their counsel and do not oppose the compromise.

[4]. In view of the report of the District and Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, and in view of the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in "Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another", 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543 and "Narinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another", (2014) 6 SCC 466, this Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose can be served by keeping with the criminal proceedings pending, since the complainant has himself compromised the dispute with the petitioners.

[5]. In the circumstances, the present petition is allowed. FIR No. 100 dated 21.07.2020 under Sections 336, 160, 120-B IPC (offences under Section 307 IPC and 25 of the Arms Act was deleted from the present FIR vide DDR No. 28 dated 21.08.2020 by the IO) 27, 54 59 of the Arms Act and Section 3 of the Epidemic Diseases Act, 1897 and Section 51 of the Disaster Management Act 1897 registered at Police Station Satnampura, Phagwara (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed on the basis of compromise *qua* the present petitioners subject to cost of Rs.10,000/- to be paid by the petitioners within a period of one month from today. The cost shall be deposited in the following account:-

**Account Name-Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar
Association Lawyer's Family Welfare Fund
Account No. 41564846387 Bank Name-SBI High Court Branch.**

**(SANJIV BERRY)
(JUDGE)**

24.05.2023

kv

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