

274

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

CRM-M No.44503 of 2016

Date of Decision: 20.02.2017

HARDEEP SINGH @ MANI & ORS

.....Petitioners

Vs

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANR

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Vikram Rathore, Advocate for
Mr. Ajay Chowdhery, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Manoj Pundir, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.245 dated 18.10.2003 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 341, 506 IPC and under Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula (Annexure P-1) as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Vide order dated 15.12.2016, parties were directed to appear before trial Court/Ilqa Magistrate and the Magistrate was directed to record their statements and submit its report *qua* the genuineness of the compromise effected between the

parties and whether any of the accused has been declared proclaimed offender in the case.

In pursuance of said order, Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Kalka 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.245 dated 18.10.2003 registered under Sections 148, 149, 323, 341, 506 IPC and under Sections 25, 54, 59 of the Arms Act at Police Station Pinjore, District Panchkula (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed.

Petition stands disposed of.

February 20, 2017

Atik

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

**(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE**

Yes/No

Yes/No