

**In the High Court for the States of Punjab and Haryana
At Chandigarh**

CRM-M-58321-2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision:-23.4.2024

Tejinder Singh and another ... Petitioners
Versus
State of Punjab and others ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GURVINDER SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Mukesh Verma, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Vishavjeet Singh Virk, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Vishal Thakur, Advocate and
Ms. Shamli, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 4.

GURVINDER SINGH GILL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners seek quashing of General Diary No.54 dated 11.4.2018 (Annexure P-2) in FIR No.141, dated 11.4.2018 registered at Police Station Shimla Puri, District Ludhiana, under Sections 324, 323, 341, 506, 148 and 149 of Indian Penal Code (Annexure P-1) & Challan dated 18.5.2020 (Annexure P-3) and all subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise stated to have been effected between the parties.
2. Vide order dated 15.12.2022, the parties had been directed to appear before the Trial Court/Duty Magistrate so as to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise.

3. Report of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana has been received, wherein it has been reported that joint statements of petitioners/accused Tejinder Singh, Karanvir Singh and also of respondent No.2 namely Paramjit Singh @ Paramjit Singh Sohal have been recorded to the effect that they have compromised the matter amongst themselves.
4. Respondent No.2 namely Paramjit Singh @ Paramjit Singh Sohal in his statement has stated that he has no objection in case the FIR/DDR in question is quashed.
5. Learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana has specifically opined that the parties have entered into compromise voluntarily and without any undue influence.
6. This Court finds that while the statement of respondent No.2/complainant – Paramjit Singh @ Paramjit Singh Sohal qua the factum of compromise has been recorded, statements of respondent No.3 – Charanjit Singh Sohal and respondent No.4 – Lakhvir Singh Sohal have not been recorded in the instant case.
7. However, since learned counsel representing the complainant has stated that he has instructions to state that compromise stands effected with all the injured including respondent No.3 – Charanjit Singh Sohal and respondent No.4 – Lakhvir Singh Sohal, therefore, he has no objection for quashing of the DDR arising out of the FIR particularly when the opposite party has also agreed to get the FIR quashed as is specifically stated in the compromise deed.
8. In view of the aforesaid compromise and bearing in mind the law laid down by Full Bench of this Court in 2007(3) RCR (Crl.) 1052 Kulwinder Singh

and others Vs. State of Punjab, the present petition is allowed and General Diary No.54 dated 11.4.2018 (Annexure P-2) in FIR No.141, dated 11.4.2018 registered at Police Station Shimla Puri, District Ludhiana, under Sections 324, 323, 341, 506, 148 and 149 of Indian Penal Code (Annexure P-1) & Challan dated 18.5.2020 (Annexure P-3) and all subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed qua petitioners.

23.4.2024
Pankaj

(Gurvinder Singh Gill)
Judge

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