

(1999) 09 P&H CK 0067
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : Criminal M. No. 23653-M of 1999

Kamal Mohan Kaura

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Punjab

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 28-09-1999

Acts Referred:

Citation : (2000) 1 RCR(Criminal) 217

Hon'ble Judges : Bakhshish Kaur, J

Advocate : P.P.S. Sidhu, I.P.S. Sidhu, Advocates for appearing Parties

Judgement

Bakhshish Kaur, J.

1. Dr. Preeti was married to Kamal Mohan Kaura according to Hindu rites on December 7, 1989, and due to exchange of hot words between her and her husband she had left the matrimonial home on May 13, 1999 and a case was registered by her.

2. On the statement of Dr. Preeti, FIR No. 127 dated 20.5.1999 under sections 406/498A/120B IPC was registered against Kamal Mohan Kaura, her husband and other relations including mother, sister of Kamal Mohan Kaura. The petitioners have, therefore, filed the petition under section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of the FIR.

3. Today both the parties have appeared in person as compromise has been affected between them. Statement of petitioner No. 1 Kamal Mohan Kaura and respondent No. 2 Dr. Preeti have been recorded.

4. Dr. Preeti has stated that with the intervention of relatives and respectables, she has compromised with the petitioners and since her inlaws have offered her rehabilitation with respect, so she does not want to pursue this case against the petitioners. The compromise deed is Annexure P2. She has further stated that she and her husband are living together since July 11, 1999.

5. Dr. Kamal Mohan Kaura, petitioner No. 1 has also supported the version of Dr.

Preeti, respondent No. 2. He has stated that since they have started living together, therefore, they have no grudge against each other.

6. From the statement of the parties, referred to above, it is obviously clear that parties have resolved their differences by arriving at a conclusion to live together. In order to abridge the strained relation between the parties, particularly when they have started living together since July 11, 1999, interest of justice demand that no further action be taken in pursuance of the FIR as continuation of the proceedings following therefrom may adversely affect relations between them. The petition stands disposed of accordingly.