

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

**CRM-M No.38840 of 2016
Date of Decision: 28.2.2017**

POOJA JAIN

.....Petitioner

Vs

UT OF CHANDIGARH & ANR.

.....Respondents

CORAM: *HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH*

Present: Mr.Raman Walia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr.Sukant Gupta, APP, U.T.Chandigarh.

Mr.Sudhir Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.6 dated 15.1.2013 registered under Sections 323, 341, 506 and 34 IPC at Police Station Sector 3, Chandigarh as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

There was a matrimonial discord. FIR in question came to fore on account of ongoing bitterness between the parties. Both the parties are ad idem that the differences between the parties have been settled by way of compromise dated 31.8.2016. Number of FIRs were registered at the instances of both the parties.

Vide order dated 3.11.2016, parties were directed to

appear before the 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, Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Chandigarh, after recording statements of the parties, has reported that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any pressure.

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 counsel for U.T.Chandigarh, 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.6 dated 15.1.2013 registered under Sections 323, 341, 506 and 34 IPC at Police Station Sector 3, Chandigarh and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed.

Petition stands disposed of.

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

February 28, 2017
anita

Whether Reasoned/Speaking

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No