

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

**CRM-M No. 22442 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 09.12.2015**

Tarsem Chand

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Akshay Jain, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mz. Rimplejeet Kaur, AAG, Punjab
for respondent No. 1/State alongwith HC Ranjit Singh.

None for respondent No. 2/complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (Oral)

Present petition, under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, on behalf of the petitioner, is for quashing of FIR No. 161, dated 15.07.2010 **(Annexure P-1)** for offences punishable under Sections 420 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station City Mansa, District Mansa and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 01.07.2015 **(Annexure P-2)** arrived at between the parties.

As per allegations, *inter alia*, the accused/petitioner has executed illegal forged and fabricated lease deed with respect to a property belonged to Dera Baba Bhai Gurdass Udasian Ashram, Mansa in favour of one Rakesh Kumar and misappropriated the price of land himself. The complainant/respondent No. 2 was appointed as Mehant by the community and its head had also got registered a deed in his favour.

Vide order dated 13.10.2015, this Court directed the learned Illaqa

Magistrate/trial Court to send report with regard to compromise in pursuance of which, a report/letter No. 731 dated 04.11.2015 has been received from the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mansa, which is taken on record as **Mark-A**. It is stated in the report that the complainant has arrived at a compromise with the accused-petitioner without any undue influence and pressure.

Learned State Counsel, on instructions from HC Ranjit Singh, states that the case is fixed for 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 the aforesaid FIR and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed.

December 09, 2015

'dk kamra'

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE