

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-60611-2022
Date of Decision:-18.04.2023

RANJIT SINGH

... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

-. -

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KARAMJIT SINGH

-. -

Present:- Mr. R.S. Manhas, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Hakam Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Saruti Sandal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

-. -

KARAMJIT SINGH, J. (Oral)

Present petition is for quashing of FIR No.89 dated 10.7.2015 registered under Sections 418, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Division No.1, Pathankot District Gurdaspur and judgment/order of sentence dated 7.5.2019 passed by Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pathankot (Annexure P-2) on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-4) along with other consequential proceedings arising thereto.

The above stated FIR was lodged on the application moved by respondent No.2-Maghar Singh against the petitioner.

On notice of motion, respondent No.2 appeared in the Court through his counsel and pleaded that he has no objection if the aforesaid complaint and judgment of conviction and order of sentence are quashed on the basis of the aforesaid compromise which has been effected between the parties.

During the course of preliminary hearing, the Appellate Court was directed to record the statements of the all the concerned parties with regard to genuineness and validity or otherwise of the aforesaid compromise.

In compliance thereof, report from the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Pathankot along with statements of the parties has been received, in which, it is mentioned that the compromise is genuine and there was no undue influence or coercion from any side.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties

Learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that in view of the settlement effected between the parties, the present petition deserves to be accepted. It has also come on record that the aforesaid compromise is genuine and the parties effected the same without any undue influence or coercion.

A Division Bench of this Court in **Sube Singh and Another vs. State of Haryana and Another, 2013(4) RCR(Criminal) 102** allowed the compromise quashing petition and quashed the FIR as well as all the subsequent proceedings thereof including judgment and order passed by the Court of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate whereby the accused persons

were convicted and sentenced to imprisonment and further held that the appeal preferred by the accused persons against the aforesaid judgment and order has been rendered infructuous.

Recently the Hon'ble Apex Court in **Criminal Appeal No.1393 of 2011** titled as **Ramawatar vs. State of Madhya Pradesh** decided on 25.10.2021 quashed all the proceedings including judgment and order of conviction and sentence passed by the trial Court against which the appeal was pending in the High Court, on the basis of the compromise effected between the parties.

In the case in hand, the parties have effected compromise. In view of the compromise, respondent No.2 does not want to take any further action against the petitioner. I am of the view that the aforesaid compromise is in the welfare and interest of the parties and will enable the parties to live in peace and enjoy their life in a dignified manner. So no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the proceedings pending in the Appellate Court.

For the reasons aforestated and having regard to the law laid down by Hon'ble Apex Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543** and Five Judges Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, this petition is allowed and criminal complaint bearing FIR No.89 dated 10.7.2015 registered under Sections 418, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Division No.1, Pathankot District Gurdaspur and judgment/order of sentence dated 7.5.2019 passed by Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Pathankot (Annexure P-2), along with

other consequential proceedings arising thereto are quashed on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-4).

Resultantly, the appeal preferred by the petitioner against the aforesaid judgment and order dated 7.5.2019 (Annexure P-2) would be rendered infructuous.

The present petition stands allowed in the aforesaid terms.

18.04.2023
Gaurav Sorot

(KARAMJIT SINGH)
JUDGE

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