

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

**CRM-M-40834 of 2017**

**Date of Decision: December 15, 2017**

Subham.....Petitioner

Versus

State of U.T and another.....Respondents

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

**Present:** Mr. Ashish Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.  
Mr. Gauttam Dutt, APP UT Chandigarh  
Mr. Rajan Bansal, Advocate for respondent No.2

\*\*\*\*\*

**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.78 dated 1.9.2017, under Sections 379 and 411 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) registered at Police Station Sector 49 Chandigarh (Annexure P1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 29.10.2017 (Annexure P2) .

Vide order dated 1.11.2017, a direction was given to the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court to record the statements of the parties and submit a report regarding the genuineness of the compromise effected between the parties and also to intimate whether any accused is proclaimed offender.

In pursuance thereof, the trial Court has submitted a report dated 9.11.2017 (forwarded by the District and Sessions Judge, Chandigarh on 14.11.2017), after recording the statements of the parties, that the complainant-Birendra Kumar, and the accused-petitioner-Shubham 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.

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.

As per the Full Bench judgement 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.

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.

The Apex Court in **Central Bureau of Investigation vs. Sadhu Ram Singla and others** (2017) 5 Supreme Court Cases 350 has

held as under:-

“Having carefully considered the singular facts and circumstances of the present case, and also the law relating to the continuance of criminal cases where the complainant and the accused had settled their differences and had arrived at an amicable arrangement, we see no reason to differ with the view taken in Manoj Sharma’s case (supra) and several decisions of this Court delivered thereafter with respect to the doctrine of judicial restraint. In concluding hereinabove, we are not unmindful of the view recorded in the decisions cited at the Bar that depending on the attendant facts, continuance of the criminal proceedings, after a compromise has been arrived at between the complainant and the accused, would amount to abuse of process of Court and an exercise in futility since the trial would be prolonged and ultimately, it may end in a decision which may be of no consequence to any of the parties.”

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.78 dated 1.9.2017, under Sections 379 and 411 IPC registered at Police Station Sector 49 Chandigarh (Annexure P1) and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

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

**December 15, 2017**  
arya

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No  
Whether Reportable : Yes/No