



Pathankot (Annexure P-1) along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 08.04.2024 (Annexure P-5).

Learned counsel for the petitioners inter alia contends that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the present case only for the reason that their son has performed marriage with respondent No.2 and thereafter, matrimonial dispute arose between the husband and wife and FIR (supra) was registered. The FIR (supra) is an outcome of matrimonial dispute which is purely private in nature and now with the intervention of the respectables, parties have resolved their dispute amicably. He further submits that the Investigating Agency after conclusion of the investigation has recommended the cancellation of the FIR (supra) and further, the same was not accepted by the jurisdictional Court.

Notice of motion for 09.09.2024.

At this stage, on the asking of the Court, Mr. Subhash Godara, Addl.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State and Mr. Sandeep Godara, Advocate accepts notice for respondent No.2 and files his vakalatnama and admits to the factum of compromise. Copy of the paper book be supplied to them during the course of day.

Service is complete.

In the meanwhile, the parties are directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate within two weeks from today or any other date convenient to the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, to get their statements recorded regarding compromise and after recording their statements, learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate is directed to send report regarding the genuineness of compromise and also to intimate whether any PO proceedings are pending against any of the party on or before the date fixed i.e. 09.09.2024.

A copy of the order be sent to learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate through fax for compliance.”

3. In compliance of the aforesaid order, a report has been received from the concerned jurisdictional Court that the compromise between the parties is genuine and arrived at without any pressure or coercion from anyone.

4. In view of the compromise and the ratio of law laid down by the



Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466, Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834* and *Shakuntala Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63* and Full Bench of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (Crl.) 1052*, this petition is allowed and FIR No.22 dated 07.06.2022 under Sections 376/409/417/420/494/506/120-B of IPC and Section 4 of POCSO Act and Sections 9/10 of Prohibition of Child Marriage Act, 2006 (Section 344 of IPC and Section 9 of POCSO Act, added subsequently) registered at Police Station Nangal Bhoor, District Pathankot (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising out of the same are quashed, qua the petitioners.

September 09, 2024
manisha

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

- | | | |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i) | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable | Yes/No |