

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-26325 of 2016
Date of Decision: 06 December, 2017

Sukhwinder Singh and others ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE FATEH DEEP SINGH

Present: Mr. Sachin Rai Vaid, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Munish Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Gautam Kaile, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

FATEH DEEP SINGH, J.
Petitioners-Sukhwinder Singh, Jagir Singh, Jarnail Singh, Amarjit Singh were found guilty and convicted under Sections 420,467,468,471 and 120-B IPC by the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class Ambala through judgment dated 31.08.2015 (Annexure P/2) and were sentenced as under:-

Under Section 420 IPC	Two years simple imprisonment and Rs.500/- each as fine.
Under Section 467 IPC	Two years simple imprisonment and Rs.500/- each as fine.
Under Section 468 IPC	Two years simple imprisonment and Rs.500/- each as fine.
Under Section 471 IPC	Two years simple imprisonment and Rs.500/- each as fine.
Under Section 120B IPC	Six months simple imprisonment.

A petition seeking quashment of complaint case No. 129/1 of 2008 dated 18.09.2008 titled as Hari Singh vs. Sukhwinder Singh

and others and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom including judgment of conviction dated 31.08.2015 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ambala on the basis of a compromise arrived at between the parties has been filed, whereupon report of the Court below was called for, which through its report dated 17.08.2016 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 his resolve to put to an end to this squabble and has considered so the compromise.

Heard, learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned State counsel.

Learned counsel for the petitioners 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 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 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, complaint case No. 129/1 of 2008 dated 18.09.2008 titled as *Hari Singh vs. Sukhwinder Singh and others* and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom including judgment of conviction dated 31.08.2015 passed by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ambala and all consequences arising thereof are hereby quashed.

The petition stands disposed off in those terms.

(FATEH DEEP SINGH)
JUDGE

December 06, 2017
aarti

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No