

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

CRM-M No.16038 of 2015 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 01.12.2015

Lal Singh and others

..... Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mrs. Manjari Joshi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Mikhail Kad, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent No.1 along with ASI Som Lal.

Mr. S.P.Soi, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

Present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 114 dated 06.06.2011, under Sections 406, 498-A, IPC, registered with Police Station City Nakodar, Jalandhar (**Annexure P-1**) and the subsequent proceedings on the basis of compromise dated 05.05.2015 (**Annexure P-6**) arrived at between the parties.

As per allegations, *inter alia*, petitioners/accused turned out respondent No.3-Anju Bala (wife of petitioner No.3-Kulwinder Singh) from her matrimonial home after giving beatings for bringing insufficient dowry. Both the parties had settled the dispute after intervention of the Panchayat for a sum of Rs.4,80,000/-. Out of which, the petitioners gave only Rs.1 Lac and rest of the amount has not been paid. Hence, the present FIR.

Vide order dated 28.09.2015, this Court directed the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court to send report with regard to compromise in pursuance of

which, a report/letter No.5820 dated 26.11.2015 has been received from the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Nakodar, which is taken on record as **Mark-A**. It is stated in the report that the complainant party has arrived at a compromise with the petitioners/accused without any undue influence and pressure.

Learned State Counsel, on instructions from A.S.I. Som Lal, states that the challan was presented against the parents-in-law whereby the husband has been declared as proclaimed offender. One prosecution witness had also been examined.

The fact of the husband being proclaimed offender would not be really matter since the dispute is a matrimonial and personal between the parties and, therefore, in the light of the comprehensive compromise, there is no legal impediment for quashing of the aforesaid FIR.

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. The aforesaid FIR and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed.

December 01, 2015

Gagan

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE