

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

**Criminal Misc. No. M-29983 of 2014
Date of decision:- 13.02.2015.**

Vinod Kumar and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Johny Goyal, Advocate for
Mr. H.S.Brar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. K.S.Aulakh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Karminster Singh, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 to 4.

SABINA, J.

Petitioners along with their co-accused had faced trial under Section under Section 406, 465, 467, 471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) in FIR No. 76 dated 10.7.2000, registered at Police Station Sadar Malout.

Trial Court vide judgment/order dated 5.1.2012 ordered the conviction and sentence of the petitioners under Sections 406 IPC. Aggrieved against the said judgment/order of their conviction and sentence, petitioners preferred an appeal before the Appellate Court. However, during the pendency of the appeal, parties have amicably settled their dispute.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that

the FIR in question was liable to be quashed as the parties had amicably settled their dispute. In support of his arguments, learned counsel for the petitioners has placed reliance on the judgment of this Court in **Sube Singh and another Vs. State of Haryana and another 2013 (4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 102**, wherein, following questions were framed for consideration:-

“(1) Whether the power exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is controlled by Section 320 Cr.P.C. or it can be invoked in an appropriate case even if the offences are not compoundable in nature?

(2) Whether criminal proceedings can be quashed by the High Court in exercise of its power under Section 482 CrPC even after the accused was found guilty and convicted by the trial court though the matter is sub judice before the appellate court?”

While dealing with question No.1, this Court in para 15 of the judgment has held as under:-

“The refusal to invoke power under Section 320 CrPC, however, does not debar the High Court from resorting to its inherent power under Section 482 CrPC and pass an appropriate order so as to secure the ends of justice.”

While dealing with question No.2, this Court in paras 16, 17 and 21 of the judgment has held under:-

“16 As regards the doubt expressed by the learned Single Judge whether the inherent power under Section 482 CrPC to quash the criminal proceedings on the basis of compromise entered into between the parties can be

invoked even if the accused has been held guilty and convicted by the trial Court, we find that in Dr.Arvind Barsaul etc. vs. State of Madhya Pradesh & Anr., 2008 (2)RCR (Criminal) 910, (2008) 5 SCC 794, the unfortunate matrimonial dispute was settled after the appellant (husband) had been convicted under Section 498-A IPC and sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment and his appeal was pending before the first appellate court. The Apex Court quashed the criminal proceedings keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice observing that "continuation of criminal proceedings would be an abuse of the process of law" and also by invoking its power under Article 142 of the Constitution. Since the High Court does not possess any power akin to the one under Article 142 of the Constitution, the cited decision cannot be construed to have vested the High Court with such like unparallel power.

17. The magnitude of inherent jurisdiction exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 CrPC with a view to prevent the abuse of law or to secure the ends of justice, however, is wide enough to include its power to quash the proceedings in relation to not only the non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 CrPC but such a power, in our considered view, is exercisable at any stage save that there is no express bar and invoking of such power is fully justified on facts and circumstances

of the case.

X-X-X-X-X-X

21. *In the light of these peculiar facts and circumstances where not only the parties but their close relatives (including daughter and son-in-law of respondent No.2) have also supported the amicable settlement, we are of the considered view that the negation of the compromise would disharmonize the relationship and cause a permanent rift amongst the family members who are living together as a joint family. Non-acceptance of the compromise would also lead to denial of complete justice which is the very essence of our justice delivery system. Since there is no statutory embargo against invoking of power under Section 482 CrPC after conviction of an accused by the trial Court and during pendency of appeal against such conviction, it appears to be a fit case to invoke the inherent jurisdiction and strike down the proceedings subject to certain safeguards.”*

Learned counsel for respondents No. 2 to 4 has placed on record affidavit of the complainant wherein he has admitted the compromise between the parties and has submitted that he has no objection if the FIR in question is ordered to be quashed.

Thus, this case is covered by the decision given by Division Bench of this Court in Sube Singh's case (supra). Accordingly, this petition is allowed. Impugned judgment/order dated 05.1.2012 of conviction and sentence passed by the trial Court, are set aside. Consequently, the criminal proceedings

against the petitioners on the basis of FIR No. 76 dated 10.7.2000, registered at Police Station Sadar Malout under Section 406, 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 IPC are quashed. Resultantly, the appeal preferred by the petitioners before the Appellate Court would be rendered infructuous and shall be so declared by the Appellate Court at Sri Muktsar Sahib.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

February 13, 2015.
Gurpret