

217 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

COCP-1359-2018

Date of Decision :10.08.2022

Harbinder Singh Rai

..... Petitioner

versus

Arpit Shukla and another

....Respondents

Coram : Hon'ble Mr. Justice B.S. Walia

Present : Mr. Tek Tejinder Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Sharda, Asstt. A.G., Punjab.

\*\*\*

B.S. Walia, J. (Oral)

[1] Prayer in the petition is for initiating proceedings against the respondents for intentional and willful defiance of directions, Annexure P/1 dated 02.07.2014 issued by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in CRA No.1277 of 2014 (@SLP (Crl.) No.9127 of 2013) in case titled as Arnesh Kumar vs. State of Bihar and another.

[2] Learned counsel contends that the instant proceedings were instituted on account of non-compliance of Section 41-A Cr.P.C. on account of registration of FIR No.126 dated 23.09.2016 for the offences under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Women Cell, Jalandhar. Learned counsel contends that during the pendency of the instant petition, the petitioner and his family on the one hand and his daughter in law on the other hand have amicably settled all disputes pertaining to the aforementioned FIR and the same was quashed by this Court vide order dated 23.09.2015 in CRM-M No.21548 of 2019 in case titled as Harbinder Singh Vs. Arpit Shukla and another and as per one of the conditions in the compromise which is part of the order quashing

the FIR, the daughter in law of the petitioner has given her no objection to the quashing of the FIR subject to the condition that the petitioner and his other family members would withdraw all proceedings instituted by them in any Court against her including COCP No.1359 of 2018.

[3] Learned counsel for the petitioner states that in view of the matter having been amicably resolved between the petitioner and his family on the one hand and his daughter-in-law on the other hand, the petitioner is not interested in pursuing the instant petition and may be permitted to withdraw the same.

[4] In view of the position noted above, as well as statement of learned counsel for the petitioner, I am of the considered view that it would be in the fitness of things and in the interest of justice to bring the instant proceedings to an end.

[5] Accordingly the contempt petition is *disposed of* as not calling for any action against the respondents under the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971.

[6] Rule discharged.

**(B.S. Walia)**  
**Judge**

10.08.2022

*amit*

*Whether speaking/ reasoned* : *Yes/No*  
*Whether reportable* : *Yes/No*