

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

**CRM-M No.11493 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 22.09.2015**

Sandeep Kumar

..... Petitioner

Vs.

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Virender Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Satish Saini, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana
for respondent No.1/State along with SI Madan Gopal.

Mr. Sudhir Hooda, Advocate for respondent No.2/complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

CRM No.31185 of 2015

Prayer in the aforementioned application is for correcting the alleged mistake whereby one of the offences has been shown as under Section 408, IPC instead of Section 406, IPC.

Learned Counsel for the applicant wishes to withdraw the present application.

In view of the above, the present application stands dismissed as withdrawn.

CRM-M No.11493 of 2015

Present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No.205 dated 30.04.2011, under Sections 408, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, registered with Police Station City Faridabad Central, District Faridabad (**Annexure P-1**) and the subsequent proceedings on the basis of compromise dated 17.03.2015 (**Annexure P-2**) arrived at between the parties.

As per allegations in the FIR, *inter alia*, petitioner/accused-Sandeep Kumar, who was employee of Metro Heart Institute, Faridabad, has forged the bills and attested with the stamp of said Hospital/Institute. The same were forwarded to the international patients from his personal E-mail I.D. and misappropriated the payments.

Vide order dated 20.08.2015, this Court directed the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court to send report with regard to compromise in pursuance of which, a report/letter No. 792 dated 18.09.2015 has been received from the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Faridabad, which is taken on record as **Mark-A**. It is stated in the report that the complainant has arrived at a compromise with the petitioner/accused without any undue influence and pressure.

Learned State Counsel, on instructions from SI Madan Gopal, submits that the case is at the stage of recording of prosecution evidence.

Hon'ble Supreme Court in **(2003) 4 SCC 675, B.S Joshi & Others Vs. State of Haryana & 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 extracts read 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) S.C 192, Nikhil Merchant Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation & 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.205 dated 30.04.2011, under Sections 408, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code and Section 67 of the Information Technology Act, registered with Police Station City Faridabad Central, District Faridabad (**Annexure P-1**) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed.

September 22, 2015

Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE