

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

**Crl. Misc. No. M- 11366 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of decision : 09.10.2015**

Puran Ram and others

..... Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab & others

... Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ANITA CHAUDHRY

Present: Mr. Atul Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. K.S. Aulakh, AAG Punjab
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Kuldip Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Parvez Chugh, Advocate
for respondent nos.2 & 3.

--

ANITA CHAUDHRY , J.

The trial of the petitioner in case DDR No. 14 dated 25.02.2008, (Annexure P-2) registered under Sections 323, 324, 34 IPC (Section 326 IPC added later on), Police Station Kotbhai, District Sri Muktsar Sahib has culminated into their conviction under the aforesaid heads and they have been substantively sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of three years. The petitioners had challenged the order of conviction and sentence by way of an appeal before the Sessions Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib. During the pendency thereof, it is claimed that

the parties have entered into compromise with the intervention of respectable persons. Compromise-deed (Annexure P-4), reiterating the factum of compromise, has been placed on record.

Report has been called from the Addl. Sessions Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib, after statements of the parties was recorded regarding the compromise. Addl. Sessions Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib has reported that the compromise is voluntary and without any pressure or coercion. He has also sent original statements and copy of compromise deed.

Learned counsel appearing for the complainant/injured states that the complainant party has no objection if the proceedings are quashed and the judgment and order of conviction and sentence are set aside.

Hon'ble the Apex Court in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Ors. 2012(10) SCC 303** has held as under:-

*"48. The question is with regard to the inherent power of the High Court in quashing the criminal proceedings against an offender who has settled his dispute with the victim of the crime but the crime in which he is allegedly involved is not compoundable Under Section **320** of the Code.*

*49. Section **482** of the Code, as its very language suggests, saves the inherent power of the High Court which it has by virtue of it being a superior court to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. It begins with the words, 'nothing in this Code' which means that the provision*

is an overriding provision. These words leave no manner of doubt that none of the provisions of the Code limits or restricts the inherent power. The guideline for exercise of such power is provided in Section [482](#) itself i.e., to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. As has been repeatedly stated that Section [482](#) confers no new powers on High Court; it merely safeguards existing inherent powers possessed by High Court necessary to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or to secure the ends of justice. It is equally well settled that the power is not to be resorted to if there is specific provision in the Code for the redress of the grievance of an aggrieved party. It should be exercised very sparingly and it should not be exercised as against the express bar of law engrafted in any other provision of the Code.

50. In different situations, the inherent power may be exercised in different ways to achieve its ultimate objective. Formation of opinion by the High Court before it exercises inherent power Under Section [482](#) on either of the twin objectives, (i) to prevent abuse of the process of any court or (ii) to secure the ends of justice, is a sine qua non.

*51. In the very nature of its constitution, it is the judicial obligation of the High Court to undo a wrong in course of administration of justice or to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process. This is founded on the legal maxim *quando lex aliquid alicui concedit, conceditur et id sine qua res ipsa esse non potest*. The full import of which is whenever anything is authorised, and especially if, as a matter of duty, required to be done by law, it is found impossible to*

do that thing unless something else not authorised in express terms be also done, may also be done, then that something else will be supplied by necessary intendment. Ex debito justitiae is inbuilt in such exercise; the whole idea is to do real, complete and substantial justice for which it exists. The power possessed by the High Court Under Section [482](#) of the Code is of wide amplitude but requires exercise with great caution and circumspection."

In **State of Karnataka v. L. Muniswami, AIR 1977**

SC 1489, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that the ends of justice are higher than ends of mere law, though justice has got to be administered according to the laws made by the legislature yet the Court proceeding ought not to be permitted to degenerate into a weapon of harassment or persecution.

The Larger Bench of this Court in the case of **Kulvinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab & Anr. 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, while discussing the scope of quashing of prosecution on the basis of compromise, by this Court in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., even in non-compoundable offence(s) has held 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.

In the case of **Sube Singh & Anr. State of Haryana & Anr. Crl. Misc. No. M-38140 of 2011, decided on 09.04.2014**, a Division Bench of this Court while dealing with the question, as to whether the criminal proceedings can be quashed in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. even after the accused was found guilty and convicted by the trial court and the matter is sub-judice before the appellate Court, answered the reference in the affirmative. Relying upon the decisions rendered in **Kulwinder Singh** and **Gian Singh** (supra), the Court observed as under:-

"16. The magnitude of inherent jurisdiction exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. with a view of prevent the abuse of law or to secure the ends of justice, however, is wide enough to include its power to quash the proceedings in relation to not only the non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 Cr.P.C. but such a power, in our considered view, is exercisable at any stage save that there is no express bar and invoking of such power is fully justified on facts and circumstances of the case."

It has further been held that:

"20 ... Since there is no statutory embargo against invoking of power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. after conviction of an accused by the trial Court and during pendency of appeal against such conviction, it appears to be a fit case to invoke the inherent

jurisdiction and strike down the proceedings subject to certain safeguards."

Adverting to the facts of present case, the parties have mutually settled their dispute and have buried the hatchet. There is nothing on record which is suggestive of the fact that the petitioners are previous convicts or any other incident has occurred during the pendency of trial/appeal.

Keeping in view the pronunciation of law and also the facts, in my opinion, it would be a fit case to exercise the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

Therefore, the instant petition is allowed. Consequently, impugned DDR and all other consequent proceedings thereto, qua the petitioners are quashed. The judgment and order of conviction and sentence are also set aside.

**(ANITA CHAUDHRY)
JUDGE**

October 09, 2015
sunil