

CRM-M No.25848 of 2015

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

CRM-M No.25848 of 2015

Date of decision: March 18, 2016

Tarsem Singh and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Jasjeet Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab, for respondent No.1.
None for respondent no. 2

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.

In the present petition preferred under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the convicts/petitioners, who were tried in a criminal case bearing FIR No. 143 dated 27.5.2007 (Annexure P1) registered at Police Station Nakodar, District Jalandhar, under Sections 326, 324, 323, 148, 149 IPC on the complaint of present respondent No.2 Tarsem Singh, were found guilty for commission of offences under Section 326, 324, 323 IPC read with section 34 IPC and the Court of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Nakodar through judgment and order of sentence dated 17.3.2014 (Annexure P4)

CRM-M No.25848 of 2015

convicted and sentenced each of them to undergo maximum rigorous imprisonment for two years.

The same was challenged by the convicts/petitioners by way of appeal before the first appellate Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jalandhar whereby conviction and sentence of the petitioners stood suspended.

It is at this juncture, parties entered into a compromise in writing by way of Compromise Deed dated 30.7.2015 (Annexure P6). It was consequent thereupon the present jurisdiction was invoked by the petitioners/convicts.

Report of the Court below was called for, which through its report dated 24.12.2015 submits on the basis of statements of the parties that the parties have amicably compromised the matter voluntarily, without any coercion, pressure or undue influence, whereby the complainant has shown her resolve to put an end to this squabble and has considered so the compromise.

Heard Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate, for the petitioners and Mr. Jasjeet Dhaliwal, AAG, Punjab, for respondent No.1 whereas none has appeared for respondent no. 2.

Learned counsel for the petitioner have sought to place reliance upon a Division Bench view of this Court in '**Sube Singh and another v. State of Haryana and another**' reported in **2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102** to impress upon this Court that the High Court is vested with unparalleled powers to quash criminal proceedings at any

CRM-M No.25848 of 2015

stage to secure the ends of justice even where after conviction an appeal is pending. Their Lordships in **Sube Singh's case** (ibid) held as under:

“The magnitude of inherent jurisdiction exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code 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 Criminal Procedure Code 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.”

Having regard to this position of law and that in similar other views reported in 2012(10) SCC 303 titled as '**Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another**' and 2014(6) SCC 466 titled as '**Narinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another**', wherein the Hon'ble Apex Court has taken a very liberal approach as to quashment of proceedings and had emphasized that quashment of such proceedings depends upon the facts and circumstances of each case and has attached primacy where such a quashment by way of compromise is essential to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court and it is only in cases which are of

CRM-M No.25848 of 2015

very heinous or serious nature like murder, rape, dacoity or corruption etc. the courts should not come to the aid and rescue of a petitioner.

In the light of the satisfaction shown by the Court below and in view of the fact that compromise will go a long way in resolving the personal dispute and to bring about personal harmony, being neighbours and more-so the offences for which the accused have been booked are not of very serious nature. Thus, this Court taking a holistic and pragmatic approach feels it essential and in the interest of justice to allow the prayer made in this petition. Thus, FIR No. 143 dated 27.5.2007 (Annexure P1) registered at Police Station Nakodar, District Jalandhar, under Sections 326, 324, 323, 148, 149 IPC along with judgment of conviction dated 17.3.2014 (Annexure P4) passed by learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Nakodar and all consequences arising thereof are hereby quashed, qua the present petitioners.

The petition stands allowed in those terms.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

March 18, 2016
'tiwana'