

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

**Crl. Misc. No. M-28002 of 2014
Date of decision: 20.07.2015.**

Kimti Lal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PARAMJEET SINGH

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Anil Mehta, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana.

None for respondent No. 2.

PARAMJEET SINGH, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been moved by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, seeking quashing of case FIR No. 690, dated 29.08.2013, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Karnal Civil Lines, District Karnal, on the basis of compromise along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Vide order dated 12.11.2014 passed by this Court, parties were directed to appear before the learned Trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to compromise and the learned Trial Court was directed to send the report.

In compliance of order dated 12.11.2014, learned Trial Court

has submitted its report vide letter dated 19.12.2014 which indicates that parties appeared before it and got recorded their respective statements with regard to validity of compromise. As per the report, compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure, coercion or undue influence from any corner. Learned counsel for the parties state that now, no dispute survives between the parties.

Consequently, in view of compromise and keeping in view the law laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Madan Mohan Abbot vs. State of Punjab, 2008(2) RCR (Criminal) 429, Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(4) R.C.R.(Criminal) 543, Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 482*** and Full Bench judgment of this Court in the case of ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Crl.) 1052***, no useful purpose would be served in prolonging the litigation, especially when this case does not fall within the category of exceptional cases where this Court should not exercise its inherent jurisdictional power to quash the criminal proceedings, as held in ***Gian Singh (supra) and Narinder Singh and others (supra)***. In the facts and circumstances of this case, it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of the criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and wrongdoer and to secure the ends of justice, therefore, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end.

The present petition is allowed. FIR No. 690, dated 29.08.2013, under Sections 406, 420, 467, 468, 471, 506, 34 of the Indian

on the basis of compromise and all the criminal proceedings arising out of the said FIR also stand quashed.

It is, however, made clear that if the proceedings already stand concluded and conviction recorded in the present case, this order shall be treated non est and, thus, will have no bearing on the conviction and sentence order.

July 20, 2015.
kanchan

(PARAMJEET SINGH)
JUDGE