

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

CRM-M No.11633 of 2016

Date of Decision:-30.05.2016

Raj Kumari & Anr.

.....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana & Anr.

.....Respondents.

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASWANT SINGH

Present:- Mr. Vaneet Soni, Advocate for the Petitioners.

Mr. Kuldip Tiwari, Additional Advocate General, Haryana
assisted by ASI Sri Niwas.

Mr. Babbar Bhan, Advocate for the Complainant.

JASWANT SINGH, J.(ORAL)

Prayer is under section 482 Cr.PC for quashing of FIR No.318 dated 02.10.2015 for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 506, 120-B of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Sahlawas District Jhajjar and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise deed (Annexure P-6).

As per the allegations levelled by the complainants-Sukhbir and Surender, petitioners-accused persons have cheated them on the pretext of selling 76 Kanal 05 marlas of land being owned by them but neither the same was sold to the complainants nor their money was returned.

Moreover, they were given threats which led to the registration of 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 09.05.2016 of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jhajjar duly forwarded by learned District & Sessions Judge, Jhajjar vide letter dated 09.05.2016 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 complainant has no objection if the aforesaid FIR and all consequential proceedings are quashed against the petitioners.

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

Learned State Counsel assisted by ASI Sri Niwas is unable to raise any serious objection in view of the statements recorded in terms of the aforesaid compromise whereby the complainants are not willing to support the case of the prosecution.

A sum of Rs.2 lacs as interest by way of cheque issued jointly in the name of Complainants has been tendered at the time of arguments and accepted by the counsel for the complainants towards full and final settlement.

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.

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, the present petition is allowed and FIR No.318 dated 02.10.2015 for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 506, 120-B of Indian Penal Code registered with Police Station Sahlawas District Jhajjar and the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed against the petitioners herein.

(JASWANT SINGH)
JUDGE

May 30, 2016