

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

CRM-M No.20405 of 2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 02.08.2018

Gagandeep Singh

...Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. M.S. Naryal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nitin Rampal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.(Oral)

By invoking Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, the petitioner has prayed for quashing of FIR No.80 dated 26.04.2013 for offence punishable under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') and Section 24 of Emigration Act, registered at Police Station City District Kapurthala and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

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

Vide order dated 14.05.2018, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial court/Illaq Magistrate to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, a report has been submitted by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kapurthala wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been recorded and compromise entered between the parties is

genuine, amicably, without any threat, coercion or pressure.

Learned counsel for the State as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 have not disputed that the parties i.e. petitioner, 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, the petition is allowed, FIR No.80 dated 26.04.2013 for offence punishable under Sections 406, 420 IPC and Section 24 of Emigration Act, registered at Police Station City District Kapurthala stands quashed qua the petitioner.

August 02, 2018
m. sharma

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	yes/no
Whether reportable	:	yes/no