

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-22631 of 2017

Date of Decision: January 29, 2018

Ankush Kumar and Others.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and Others.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr.Sunil K.Nehra,Advocate for the petitioners.
Ms.Harpreet Kaur, Assistant Advocate General,Haryana
Mr.Rohit Jindal, Advocate for
Mr.Gagan Pawar,Advocate for respondents No. 2 to 4

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J.

Petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No. 214 dated 19.10.2016 under Section 379-B and 325 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) registered at Police Station Bilaspur, District Yamunanagar (Annexure P1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of affidavit/compromise dated 3.6.2017 (Annexures P2 to P5) .

Vide order dated 11.9.2017, a direction was given to the Illaqa Magistrate 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 9.10.2017 (forwarded by the District and Sessions Judge Yamuna Nagar on 12.10.2017), after recording the statements of the parties. The trial Court has submitted that the complainant-injured-Anil Kumar as well as other eye witnesses-Om Pal and Satish Kumar and accused- Ankush Kumar, Ramjan, Ankit @ Gayani and Pardeep 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. It is further reported that the statement of the Investigation Officer is recorded and none of the petitioners is declared as proclaimed offender.

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.

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.”

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.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No. 214 dated 19.10.2016 under Section 379-B and 325 IPC registered at Police

Station Bilaspur, District Yamunanagar (Annexure P1) along with all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner by way of compromise subject to the petitioner paying costs in the sum of ₹ 10,000/- in the Office of District Legal Services Authority, Jagadhri within 8 weeks from today, failing which this order shall stand recalled automatically without reference to the Court.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

January 29,2018
arya

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