



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

217

CRM-M-1694-2023

Date of Decision: 22.05.2024

Ramandeep Singh and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - None for the petitioners.

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

None for respondent No. 2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 96 dated 20.10.2020 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Kabirpur, District Kapurthala and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 17.02.2022 (Annexure P-2).

Perusal of the order sheets reveals that vide order dated 12.01.2023, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, while issuing notice of motion had directed the parties to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, on 22.02.2023 for recording their statements qua genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, report from the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sultanpur Lodhi, vide letter dated 17.04.2023 duly forwarded



by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Kapurthala, was received. It was reported that petitioners No. 1 and 3, namely, Ramandeep Singh and Bhupinder Kaur as well as respondent No. 2-complainant No. 2 have appeared before the learned trial Court and their statements have also been recorded. However, petitioner No. 2-Poonam Kaur-sister-in-law/*Nanad*, of respondent No. 2-complainant had not appeared before the learned trial Court for recording her statement qua genuineness of compromise. In view of this report, counsel for the petitioners had sought time on 25.09.2023 to get instructions in the matter.

Thereafter, the matter was listed for hearing for 03 times, out of which on 02 dates i.e. 17.01.2023 and 20.03.2024, the petitioners have gone un-represented; whereas on one date i.e. 06.02.2024, respondent No. 2-complainant had gone un-represented.

Today also, despite the case having been called twice, none has put in appearance on behalf of the petitioners and on behalf of respondent No. 2-complainant as well. Therefore, it can safely be presumed that the petitioners or their counsel are no more interested in pursuing the instant petition. Thus, this Court is left with no other option except to dismiss the instant petition for non-prosecution.

Ordered accordingly.

22.05.2024

rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No