

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

**CRM-M No.14446 of 2018 (O&M)**  
**Date of decision: 28.08.2018**

Rohit Gaur and others ...Petitioners

**VERSUS**

State of Punjab and others ..Respondents

**CRM-M No.22646 of 2018 (O&M)**

Gurwinder Singh and another ....Petitioners

**VERSUS**

State of Punjab and another ....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI**

Present: Ms. Pooja Chopra, Advocate  
for the petitioners(*in CRM-M-14446-2018*).

Mr. Mukesh K. Bhatnagar, Advocate  
for the petitioners (*in CRM-M-22646-2018*)  
for respondents No.3 and 4 (*in CRM-M-14446-2018*).

Mr. Inderjit Sharma, Advocate  
for respondent No.2 (*in CRM-M-22646-2018*).

Mr. V.G. Jauhar, Senior DAG, Punjab.

**RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(Oral)**

This order shall dispose of two petitions bearing *CRM-M No.14446 of 2018* titled as *Rohit Gaur and others Vs. State of Punjab and others* and *CRM-M No.22646 of 2018* titled as *Gurwinder Singh and another Vs. State of Punjab and another* as both the petitions are the outcome of one and the same FIR.

By invoking Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No.220 dated 01.11.2017 for the offences punishable under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian

Police Station Police Line, District Bathinda and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

In the present case, the FIR was registered on the statement of Darshan Singh son of Harnek Singh. Now, dispute between the parties has been resolved.

Vide order dated 24.05.2018, the parties were directed to appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, a report has been submitted by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bathinda wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been recorded and compromise entered between the parties is genuine, voluntary, out of their free will and the same are not the result of any pressure.

Learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 have not disputed that the parties i.e. petitioners, respondent No.2 (complainant), have arrived at a settlement with an intent to give burial to their differences.

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 Cr.P.C. Keeping in view authoritative enunciation of law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **'Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another', 2012 (4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543** and in the light of facts and circumstances discussed hereinbefore, 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 the same are put to an end.

For the foregoing reasons, both the petitions are allowed, FIR No.220 dated 01.11.2017 for the offences punishable under Sections 465, 467,

Station Police Line, District Bathinda and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise stand quashed qua the petitioners.

August 28, 2018  
*m. sharma*

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : yes/no

Whether reportable : yes/no