

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

Date of decision:06.10.2015

Parveen Kumar

.....Petitioner

v.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Ms.Poonam Rani,Advocate for
Mr.Gurpartap Singh Gill,Advocate for the petitioner
Ms.Rimplejeet Kaur,AAG Punjab
with ASI Rajinder Kumar.

Jaswant Singh,J.(Oral)

Prayer is for quashing of FIR No.14 dated 27.2.2015 under Sections 420 IPC, PS Singh Bhagwantpura,Distt.Ropar(P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise (P-2).

Vide order dated 9.7.2015 parties were directed to appear before the learned trial court to get their statements recorded with respect to the compromise.

In compliance thereof learned JMIC,Rupnagar vide his report dated 21.8.2015 in view of statements of the parties has reported that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine, with free consent and without any pressure. The said report is taken on record as Mark-A.

As per allegations in the FIR the petitioner struck a deal for sending son of the complainant to Italy for a sum of Rs.7 lacs out of which Rs.2.83 lacs were paid by the complainant. However, neither son of the complainant was sent abroad nor money returned.

Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Rajinder Kumar states that investigations are still going on.

Hon'ble Supreme Court in **(2003)4 SCC 675, B.S.Joshi and others v State of Haryana and another** has made it explicitly clear in para 15 of its judgment that the High Court in exercise of its inherent powers can quash criminal proceedings or FIR or complaint and Section 320 of the Code does not limit or effect the powers under Section 482 of the Code.

A Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others v State of Punjab and another, 2007(3)RCR(Criminal) 1052** has held that this Court, in appropriate cases, while exercising powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., may quash an FIR disclosing the commission of non-compoundable offences. The relevant extract reads as under:-

“The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C., which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences

notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.”

Hon'ble Apex Court in another case in **J.T.2008(9) SC 192 Nikhil Merchant v Central Bureau of Investigation and Another** while relying upon its decision in **B.S.Joshi's** case (supra) has also held that in view of the compromise arrived at between the parties, the technicalities should not be allowed to stand in the way in the quashing of criminal proceedings and the continuance of the same after compromise between the parties would be a futile exercise.

Similar views were expressed by Hon'ble the Apex Court in **Madan Mohan Abot v State of Punjab, 2008(4) SCC 582**, the relevant extract of which is as under:-

“We need to emphasise that it is perhaps advisable that in disputes where the question involved is of a purely personal nature, the court should ordinarily accept the terms of the compromise even in criminal proceedings as keeping the matter alive with no possibility of a result in favour of the prosecution is a luxury which the courts, grossly overburdened as they are, cannot afford and that the time so saved can be utilised in deciding more effective and meaningful litigation. This is a common sense approach to the matter based on ground of realities and bereft of the technicalities of the law.”

Keeping in view the above settled legal position and taking

into account the fact that both the parties have desired to live in peace and harmony and carry on with their lives without any ill will or rancour by resolving their differences and entering into the aforesaid compromise, it is evident that it is a fit case where there is no impediment in the way of the Court to exercise its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing of the FIR in the interest of justice.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No.14 dated 27.2.2015 under Sections 420 IPC, PS Singh Bhagwantpura, Distt. Ropar (P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

06.10.2015.
joshi

(Jaswant Singh)
Judge