

263

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

CRM-M No.17325 of 2017
Date of Decision: 26.04.2018

Balram

.....Petitioner

Vs

State of Haryana and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Arvind Kumar Yadav, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Neelam Kashyap, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Pradeep Panwar, Advocate
for respondent No.4-complainant.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (Oral)

1. Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.20 dated 21.01.2017 under Sections 406 and 420 IPC registered at Police Station Khol, District Rewari (Annexure P-1) as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

2. Vide order dated 04.09.2017, parties were directed to appear before the trial Court and the trial Court was directed to record their statements and submit its report qua the genuineness of the compromise effected between the parties.

3. In pursuance of said order, Judicial Magistrate Ist

Class, Rewari, 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.

4. As per statement of the parties, an amount of Rs.92,845/- has been returned to the complainant and the same has been acknowledged by the complainant in his statement dated 19.12.2017 recorded by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Rewari.

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.**

8. Resultantly, FIR No.20 dated 21.01.2017 under Sections 406 and 420 IPC registered at Police Station Khol, District Rewari (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed.

9. Petition stands disposed of.

26.04.2018
jyoti

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No