

250

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

CRM-M No.37164 of 2016

Date of Decision: 07.03.2017

Harpal Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Vs

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Shilesh Gupta, Addl, AG, Punjab.

Mr. A.P.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.40 dated 22.09.2013 registered under Sections 343/365/368/506/323 IPC (Sections 365/368/323 IPC were deleted vide DDR No.6 dated 04.02.2014 and the FIR remained under Sections 343/506/34 IPC) at Police Station Samalsar, District Moga, Charge-sheet dated 05.06.2014 as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Vide order dated 19.10.2016, parties were directed to

appear before Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court and the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court was directed to record their statements and submit its report qua the genuineness of the compromise effected between the parties.

In pursuance of said order, Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Baghapurana, after recording statements of the parties, has reported that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any undue influence and coercion.

This Court is of the opinion that in view of compromise between the parties, chances of conviction of the accused are remote and there is minimal chance of the witnesses coming forward to depose in support of prosecution version. In view of remote chances of conviction, it would be appropriate to exercise discretionary power of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to put an end to the controversy for all times to come. The compromise would facilitate both the parties to live in peace and to maintain public tranquility and offence in question is personal in nature and does not involve any heinous and serious offence of any mental depravity, nor it involves any offence covered under Prevention of Corruption Act. Therefore, when possibility of conviction is remote and bleak, continuation

of criminal proceedings would put the accused to oppression and prejudice. In such a situation the exercise of power to quash the proceedings would be in consonance with the provisions of law to meet ends of justice and to prevent unnecessary continuation of proceedings which may ultimately result in some unnecessary vagaries of criminal trial.

Learned State counsel, however, objects to the aforesaid course, but in order to prevent unnecessary continuation of criminal proceedings on the ground that there are bleak chances of conviction in the case, this Court is of the opinion that it would be in fitness of things to quash the proceedings on the basis of compromise.

The compromise in question is fully in consonance with the guidelines framed in **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052** and **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another 2012 (4) RCR (Crl.) 543.**

Resultantly, FIR No.40 dated 22.09.2013 registered under Sections 343/365/368/506/323 IPC (Sections 365/368/323 IPC were deleted vide DDR No.6 dated 04.02.2014 and the FIR remained under Sections 343/506/34 IPC) at Police Station Samalsar, District Moga, Charge-sheet dated 05.06.2014 as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising

therefrom are quashed.

Petition stands disposed of.

March 07, 2017

Prince

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether reportable

Yes/No