

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA

AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-49941-2019 (O&M)

Reserved on: 01.02.2023

Pronounced on: 17.02.2023

Uniglobal Services Pvt. Ltd. & another

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana & another

...Respondent (s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present:- Mr. Abhishek Kaushik, Advocate with
Mr. B.B. Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajat Gautam, DAG, Haryana.

ANOOP CHITKARA, J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
610	30.9.2019	DLF, Gurugram	406, 420, 506 IPC

The petitioners, 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 aggrieved person.

2. 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.

3. After that, the petitioners came up before this Court to quash the FIR, impleading the aggrieved person as respondent no.2.

4. 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.

5. On 29.11.2019, the aggrieved person/complainant Rohit Kalluri (respondent-2) appeared before the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gurugram and stated that there would be no objection if the court quashes this FIR and consequent proceedings. As per the

concerned court's report dated 10.12.2019, the parties consented to the quashing of FIR and consequent proceedings without any threat. Learned Magistrate has further submitted that apart from the present complainant, there are four more victims in the case namely Usha Rani, Rahul Sinha, Abhishek Kumar and Jackson Joseph.

ANALYSIS & REASONING:

6. The petitioners had not arraigned Usha Rani, Rahul Sinha, Abhishek Kumar and Jackson Joseph as respondents in this case. Though they had filed applications for their impleadment in the case and same were allowed on 01.02.2023 by this Court, but there is nothing in the application about compromise.
7. 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.
8. 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 person 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

February 17, 2023
AK

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes
Whether reportable	:	No