

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANAT AT
CHANDIGARH.**

Date of Decision:-09.10.2015

CRM-M No.7917 of 2015

Nirmal Singh & Ors.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab & Ors.

.....Respondents.

AND

CRM-M No.8053 of 2015

Amrik Singh & Anr.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab & Ors.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Mandeep Singh Sodhi, Advocate for Petitioners
(in CRM-M No.7917 of 2015) &
for respondent nos.2 to 4 in CRM-M No.8053 of 2015.

Mr. Mikhail Kad, AAG Punjab along with
HC Jagtar Singh.

Mr. Neeraj Madan, Advocate for
Mr. Rajesh Kapila, Advocate for Petitioners
(in CRM-M No.8053 of 2015) &
for respondent nos.2 & 3 in CRM-M No.7917 of 2015).

JASWANT SINGH, J.(ORAL)

By this common order I shall dispose off both the aforementioned petitions as they are cross version cases i.e. one main FIR & other cross version in the said FIR.

Prayer is under section 482 Cr.PC for quashing of **FIR** No.40 dated 08.05.2009 for offences punishable under Sections 323, 325, 341, 506 and 34 of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Mamdot, District Ferozepur and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom as well as **Cross Version** registered on the statement of Balwinder Kaur for causing injuries to Balwinder Kaur and Karaj Singh wherein later on offence under Section 326 IPC was added on the basis of compromise both dated 22.10.2013 (Annexure **P-2**).

As per allegations in the FIR case levelled by complainant Jodh Singh on 6.5.2009 at about 9.30 pm when after taking meal he was going towards his house and was corssing the gate of house of hi8s brother Gurdev Singh, then the sons of his brother Gurdev Singh and his sister-in-law Balwinder Kaur armed with Gandali, Sotta and Iron rod attacked him and inflicted injuries on his person which resulted into lodging of the aforesaid FIR whereas in the Cross Version case registered on the statement of Balwinder Kaur for causing injuries to Balwinder Kaur and Karaj Singh, which resulted into lodging of Cross Version in the aforesaid FIR.

Upon notice of motion parties were given liberty to approach the learned Illaqa Magistrate by making appropriate application for getting their statements recorded in terms of the compromise and who shall submit its report regarding the genuineness of the compromise.

Report (Mark-A) in the shape of letter dated 24.08.2015 of learned Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Ferozepur duly forwarded by the

learned District & Sessions Judge, Ferozepur vide his endorsement dated 28.08.2015 has been received wherein it is stated that the parties appeared before that court and suffered statements recorded separately in terms of the compromise thereby stated that the matter between the parties has been compromised and complainants in both FIR as well as Cross Version have no objection if the aforesaid FIR as well as Cross Version and all consequential proceedings are quashed against the petitioners-accused.

From the report submitted it is evident that the dispute between the petitioners-accused and the complainant has been amicably resolved by entering into compromise wherein the complainant has stated that he has no objection if the present FIR against the petitioners-accused is quashed.

Learned State Counsel on instructions from HC Jagtar Singh submits that the evidence in both aforesaid cases is complete and is unable to raise any serious objection in view of the statements recorded in terms of the aforesaid compromise whereby the complainant is not willing to support the case of the prosecution.

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 also 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 legal 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, both the aforesaid petitions are allowed and FIR No.40 dated 08.05.2009 for offences punishable under Sections 323, 325, 341, 506 and 34 of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Mamdot, District Ferozepur as well as Cross Version registered in the aforesaid FIR and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed against the petitioners-accused in both the petitions.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

October 09, 2015
Vinay