

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

**CRM-M No. 36449 of 2015 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 17.12.2015**

Ravinder Kumar and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present: Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Satish Saini, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No. 1/State assisted by SI Suresh Kumar.

JASWANT SINGH, J. (ORAL)

Present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure on behalf of the petitioners, is for quashing of FIR No. 212, dated 01.06.2014 (**Annexure P-1**) for offences punishable under Sections 148, 149, 307, 323, 324, 326 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Pehowa, District Kurukshetra and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 17.10.2015 (**Annexure P-2**) arrived at between the parties.

As per allegations, *inter alia*, Ravinder Kumar (petitioner No. 1) hit the complainant-Amrit Pal Sandhu (respondent No. 2) with *Sua* and other accused-petitioners gave slaps blow and fists on the head of complainant party while the complainant was sitting on their Basta/Seat. The reason of scuffle is that when the uncle of complainant, namely Gehal Singh Sandhu (respondent No. 3) was President of the Bar, he had asked the petitioner Nos. 1 to 3 to remove their sheds illegally covering the area earmarked for construction of chambers for lawyers' and they had refused to remove their sheds.

Vide order dated 21.10.2015, this Court directed the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court to send report with regard to compromise in pursuance

of which, a report/letter No. 816 dated 14.12.2015 has been received from the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Pehowa, 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 accused-petitioners without any undue influence and pressure.

Learned State Counsel, assisted by SI Suresh Kumar, submits that the case is at the stage of commencement 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. More so, when it is highly debatable that whether the alleged offence under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code is made out or not.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioners.

December 17, 2015

'dk kamra'

**(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE**