

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-13848 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 14.7.2015**

Harjit Kaur and another

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK

Present: Mr. Mr. H.S.Lalli, Advocate
for the petitioners.

- 1.Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?**
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK J.(ORAL):

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that parties have arrived at an amicable settlement by way of settlement agreement dated 13.7.2015. He further submits that in view of the the compromise arrived at between the parties, present petition deserves to be allowed and the impugned FIR No.54 dated 4.2.2014 registered under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code ('IPC' for short) at Police Station Sector 5, Gurgaon, alongwith consequential proceedings arising therefrom may be quashed.

The abovesaid settlement agreement dated 13.7.2015 is taken on record as 'Mark A'.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Ashish Yadav, Additional A.G. Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

At this stage, Ms. Promila Nain, Advocate, accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2, on instructions from Smt. Rinku Bhogal-respondent No.2 who is present in Court, submits that finally, good sense has prevailed upon the parties and respondent No.2 and her husband namely Parvinder Singh Bhogal, have decided to live together. She further submits that since the matter has been amicably settled, respondent No.2 has no objection in case present petition is allowed and the impugned FIR alongwith consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is quashed.

Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and after careful perusal of the record of the case, particularly the settlement agreement Mark A, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case for exercising the inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C., so as to secure the ends of justice. It is so said because the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement by way of compromise (Mark A). The compromise is without any pressure and a genuine one. In such a situation, continuation of the prosecution would result in sheer abuse of process of law.

The abovesaid view taken by this Court also finds support from the judgments of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Shiji**

@ Pappu and others versus Radhika and another, 2012 (1) RCR (criminal) 9 and also from the larger Bench judgment of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others versus State of Punjab and another reported as 2007 (3) RCR (criminal) 1052**. The observations made by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in para 13 of the judgment in Shiji's case (supra), which can be gainfully followed in the present case, read as under:

"It is manifest that simply because an offence is not compoundable under Section 320 IPC is by itself no reason for the High Court to refuse exercise of its power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. That power can in our opinion be exercised in cases where there is no chance of recording a conviction against the accused and the entire exercise of a trial is destined to be an exercise in futility. There is a subtle distinction between compounding of offences by the parties before the trial Court or in appeal on one hand and the exercise of power by the High Court to quash the prosecution under Section 482 Cr.P.C. on the other. While a Court trying an accused or hearing an appeal against conviction, may not be competent to permit compounding of an offence based on a settlement arrived at between the parties in cases where the offences are not

compoundable under Section 320, the High Court may quash the prosecution even in cases where the offences with which the accused stand charged are non-compoundable. The inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. are not for that purpose controlled by Section 320 Cr.P.C. Having said so, we must hasten to add that the plenitude of the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by itself, makes it obligatory for the High Court to exercise the same with utmost care and caution. The width and the nature of the power itself demands that its exercise is sparing and only in cases where the High Court is, for reasons to be recorded, of the clear view that continuance of the prosecution would be nothing but an abuse of the process of law. It is neither necessary nor proper for us to enumerate the situations in which the exercise of power under Section 482 may be justified. All that we need to say is that the exercise of power must be for securing the ends of justice and only in cases where refusal to exercise that power may result in the abuse of the process of law. The High court may be justified in declining interference if it is

called upon to appreciate evidence for it cannot assume the role of an appellate court while dealing with a petition under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Subject to the above, the High Court will have to consider the facts and circumstances of each case to determine whether it is a fit case in which the inherent powers may be invoked."

The law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Shiji's** case (supra) has been further reiterated by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in its later judgments including in the cases of **Jayrajsinh Digvijaysinh Rana v. State of Gujarat and another, 2012 (12) SCC 401, Gold Quest International Private Limited v. State of Tamil Nadu & Ors., 2014 (4) RCR (Crl) 206, Manohar Singh v. State of Madhya Pradesh and another, 2014 AIR (SC) 3649 and Narinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466.**

Reverting back to the facts of the present case, this Court has satisfied itself that the compromise arrived at between the parties is a genuine one. In view of the genuine compromise arrived at between the parties and also in view of the settlement agreement Mark A, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the continuation of the prosecution any further would be nothing but sheer abuse of the process of law. It would result in wastage of valuable time of the Court because no chance of conviction is left.

Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the

case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned and to secure the ends of justice, FIR No.54 dated 4.2.2014 registered under Sections 498-A/406/34 IPC at Police Station Sector 5, Gurgaon and the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed, however, qua the petitioners only.

Resultantly, with the abovesaid observations made, instant petition stands allowed.

(RAMESHWAR SINGH MALIK)
JUDGE

14.7.2015
AK Sharma