

## Paramjeet Singh Alias Pamma Vs The State of Punjab and Another

**Court:** High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

**Date of Decision:** Aug. 18, 2011

**Acts Referred:** Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) â€” Section 482  
Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) â€” Section 148, 149, 323, 324, 325

**Hon'ble Judges:** Ajai Lamba, J

**Bench:** Single Bench

**Final Decision:** Allowed

### Judgement

Ajai Lamba, J.

This petition has been filed u/s 482, Code of Criminal Procedure, praying for quashing of cross version under Sections

325, 324, 323, 34, Indian Penal Code, registered on the statement of respondent No. 2/Sukhdev Singh, in FIR No. 15 dated 13.2.2005 under

Sections 326, 325, 452, 148, 149, 323, Indian Penal Code, Police Station, Nihal Singh Wala, District Moga (Annexure P-1) and subsequent

proceedings, on the basis of compromise dated 12.1.2011 (Annexure P-5).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that an incident took place in which both the sides were injured. The FIR came to be lodged at the

instance of petitioner/Paramjeet Singh alias Pamma, in which respondent No. 2 and others have been arrayed as accused. The cross version has

been recorded at the instance of Sukhdev Singh (respondent No. 2) and petitioner/Paramjeet Singh alias Pamma is being prosecuted.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner and respondent No. 2 contend that all the disputes between the parties have been settled by way of

compromise (Annexure P-5). It has been pleaded that the parties are residents of the same village and, in the interest of peace and harmony, do

not want to prosecute each other.

4. Respondent No. 2/Sukhdev Singh, as identified by his counsel Shri Rajesh Bhatheja, Advocate, is present in court and states that he is not

ready to prosecute the petitioner, in view of terms of compromise (Annexure P-5) and he would not be bringing any evidence to Court.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent-State contends that because the disputes have been settled by way of compromise, the State would have

no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

6. Having considered the stand of respondent No. 2, I am of the considered opinion that no purpose in law would be served by continuance of

proceedings. Rather, in the interest of peace and harmony, the cross version recorded in the FIR needs to be quashed because the petitioner and

respondent No. 2 want to live in peace.

7. In view of the above, the petition is allowed.

8. Cross version under Sections 325, 324, 323, 34, Indian Penal Code, registered on the statement of respondent No. 2/Sukhdev Singh, in FIR

No. 15 dated 13.2.2005 under Sections 326, 325, 452, 148, 149, 323, Indian Penal Code, Police Station, Nihal Singh Wala, District Moga

(Annexure P-1) and subsequent proceedings, are hereby quashed.