

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 31581 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision : 15.12.2017

...

Paramjit Singh and others

.....Petitioners

vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice H. S. Madaan

Present: Mr. Sharad Mehra, Advocate for the petitioners

Ms. Samina Dhir, Deputy Advocate General, Punjab

Mr. Pratik Pandit, Advocate for

Mr. Chetan Bansal, Advocate for respondents No. 2 to 4.

...

H. S. Madaan, J. (Oral)

Petitioners - Paramjit Singh and others have brought the instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 113 dated 5.6.2013, for offences under Sections 323, 324, 326, 430, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Patti, District Tarn Taran, against them, alongwith consequential proceedings arising therefrom i.e. Report Roznamcha No. 25 dated 6.6.2013, on the basis of compromise, stated to have been effected between them and complainant Inder Singh, Baljit Kaur and Gurbachan Singh - arrayed

as respondents No.2 to 4.

When the petition came up for hearing on 28.8.2017, notice of motion was ordered to be issued. The respondent No. 1 - State of Punjab through State counsel, whereas respondents No.2 to 4 through Mr. Chetan Bansal, Advocate, had put in appearance. Then in light of the contention that parties have since effected compromise, they were directed to put in appearance before the trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to compromise and the trial Court was directed to send a report to this Court.

Report has been received from Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Patti, in terms of which complainant Inder Singh, Baljit Kaur, Gurbachan Singh and accused, namely, Paramjit Singh, Amardeep Singh @ Raja, Surjit Singh @ Kala and Uttam Singh had appeared there and their statements were recorded, in terms of which they have admitted to have entered into a voluntary compromise, with free will, without any pressure, coercion or undue influence. Further complainant has stated that they have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed by this Court. There is nothing on record to doubt the genuineness of the compromise so arrived at between the parties. It has been reported that no accused has been declared proclaimed offender in the FIR in question. Alongwith the report statement of the complainant and the accused, in original, have been annexed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, besides going through the record.

Keeping in view the fact that the dispute between the

parties has been resolved amicably, which appears to have been arrived at between them voluntarily without any threat or coercion and in terms of ratio of the authority reported as **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others** 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, where in para 28, it has been held as under :-

“The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour. It is the soul of justice and if the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is used to enhance such a compromise which, in turn, enhances the social amity and reduces friction, then it truly is “*finest hour of justice*”. Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters, commercial transactions and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. in the event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases. There can never be any such rigid rule to prescribe the exercise of such power, especially in the absence of any premonitions to forecast and predict eventualities which the cause of justice may throw up during the course of a litigation.”

The compromise is in interest of peace and tranquility in the society and for such like reasons this Court can quash the FIR and ancillary

proceedings exercising power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., it appears to be a fit case to exercise such powers.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the abovesaid FIR alongwith ancillary proceedings are hereby quashed.

(**H.S. Madaan**)
Judge

15.12.2017

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