

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT  
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-10050 of 2017  
Date of Decision: September 29, 2017

Amritpal Singh

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

**CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN**

**Present:** Mr.B.S.Randhawa,Advocate for the petitioners.  
Ms.Simranjeet Kaur,Assistant Advocate General Punjab  
Mr.S.S.Gill,Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3

\*\*\*\*\*

**ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J.**

Petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No. 46 dated 13.3.2017, under Sections 307, 427, 506 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) and Section 25/27 of the Arms Act, 1959 (for short 'the Act') registered at Police Station Gharinda District Amritsar Rural (Annexure P1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 14.3.2017 (Annexure P2).

Vide order dated 23.3.2017, a direction was given to the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to record the statements of the parties and submit a report regarding the genuineness of the compromise effected between the parties viz-a-viz number of accused involved in the case and whether any of the accused has been declared proclaimed offender or not.

In pursuance thereof, the trial Court has submitted a report dated 12.4.2017 (forwarded by District and Sessions Judge, Patiala on 17.4.2017), after recording the statements of the parties, that the complainant-Jatinder Singh and Jugraj and accused-Amritpal Singh have appeared along with their respective counsel, who had identified them and got their statements recorded acknowledging that the compromise had been effected voluntarily, without any coercion or any undue influence and no proclamation proceedings are pending against the accused. This fact is not disputed by learned State Counsel, who has submitted, on instructions from Sub Inspector-Sukhdev Singh that the petitioners are not the proclaimed offenders. .

A perusal of the FIR shows that due to election grudge, accused made a gun shot which hit the car from back side. Learned State Counsel, on instructions from SI Sukhdev Singh, has submitted that the offence under Section 307 is not made out as injury though reported as grievous but the same is not dangerous to life.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052,** High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution where the High Court felt that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of any Court or to otherwise secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

Perusal of allegations in the FIR reveals that the present case squarely falls in the category of cases that can be quashed by the High

Court, in exercise of its inherent power under Section 482 of the Code. Keeping in view authoritative enunciation of law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court of India in “**Gian Singh vs State of Punjab and another**”, **2012(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543** and in the light of facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court is of the considered opinion that continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law and it is expedient in the interest of justice that criminal proceedings are put to an end.

The Apex Court in **Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another** 2014(2) RCR(Criminal) 482 has laid down certain guidelines/parameters wherein even for offence under Section 307 IPC, this Court in exercise of its power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. can take cognizance of a compromise wherein such compromise has been effected at the very initial stage.

This Court in **Manjit Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others** 2017(2)RCR(Criminal) 311 has held that even though the complainant is stated to have suffered a grievous injury on his head on account of a gandasi blow and which in turn has attracted offence under Section 336 as well as 307 IPC yet in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, FIR can be quashed.

Since the parties have arrived at a compromise and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose would be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No. 46 dated 3.3.2017, under Sections 307, 427, 506 read with Section 34 IPC, and

Section 25/27 of the Act registered at Police Station Gharinda District Amritsar (Annexure P1) and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners .

**(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)**  
**JUDGE**

**September 29, 2017**

arya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No