

# VERDICTUM.IN

1

ITEM NO.47

COURT NO.4

SECTION II-B

## S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition for Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No. 17731/2024

[Arising out of impugned judgment and order dated 12-11-2024 in CRM-M No. 44474/2023 passed by the High Court of Punjab & Haryana at Chandigarh]

PUNEET KUMAR @ PUNIT KUMAR

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA & ANR.

Respondent(s)

(FOR ADMISSION and IA No.291707/2024-EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T. )

Date : 18-12-2024 This petition was called on for hearing today.

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HRISHIKESH ROY  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE S.V.N. BHATTI

For Petitioner(s) Mr. Aman Bansal, Adv.  
Ms. Madiya Mushtaq, Adv.  
Mr. Pranjal Kishore, AOR

For Respondent(s)

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

Heard Mr. Pranjal Kishore, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner.

2. The issue to be considered here is whether on the basis of the compromise reached between the informant and the petitioner (one of the accused), on 02.06.2023 (Annexure P-2), the quashment of the FIR on the petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. should have been ordered by the Court. In this case, the petitioner was not named in the FIR and was roped in on the basis of the statement by a co-accused (Krishan Soni).

3. On the legal aspect, the counsel draws the attention of the

## VERDICTUM.IN

2

Court to the chart at "Page-D" to point out that different High Courts had taken contrary positions on the issue as to whether on the face of compromise with one or few of the accused in the case, the case can be part quashed by the Court.

4. Issue notice, returnable in six weeks.

5. In the meantime, the trial may continue but not qua the petitioner.

(GEETA JOSHI)  
SENIOR PERSONAL ASSISTANT

(KAMLESH RAWAT)  
ASSISTANT REGISTRAR