

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

Crl. Misc. M 24289 of 2018 (O&M)

Date of decision: 24.9.2018

Hansa Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondent

CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR

Present: Mr. Ashok Bhardwaj, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Ms. Seena Mand, DAG, Punjab.

JAISHREE THAKUR, J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking for quashing of FIR No. 9 dated 4.2.2014 (Annexure P/1) registered under Sections 354/354-A/354-D/509/500 IPC at Police Station Sandaur, District Sangrur and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise (Annexure P/4).

2. The facts in brief are that the aforesaid FIR was registered on the statement of complainant—Gurmeet Kaur/respondent No.2, wherein she alleged that she work as a daily wager labourer. The petitioners/accused used to follow her and petitioner No.1/accused used obscene language. He used to do this for the last one year and used to say that she has illicit relations with Nambardar Baljeet Singh @ Billu. Apart from other allegations, it was stated that the complainant had told petitioner

No.1/accused that her children are married and he should stop doing all this, but he did not stop. Initially fearing disgrace, she did not report the matter, but ultimately the aforesaid FIR was got lodged.

3. After completion of investigation, challan was presented, charges were framed and the petitioners were put on trial. The trial court vide judgment dated 18.2.2017 held the petitioners guilty and convicted them for the offences they were charged with and sentenced them to undergo rigorous imprisonment substantially for a period of two years under Sections 354-D, 354-A, 354, 509 and 500 IPC. The aforesaid judgment has been challenged in the appeal, which is pending before the Sessions Court, Sangrur.

4. During the pendency of the criminal appeal, the present petition has been filed stating that the matter has been compromised between the parties. Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before trial court for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report has been received from the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Malerkotla, stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

5. Learned counsel for the respondent—State submits that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone

through the record. In a decision, based on compromise, none of the parties is a loser. Rather, a compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society.

7. In **Sube Singh Versus State of Haryana 2013 (4) RCR (Criminal) 102**, a Division bench of this Court was seized of a question whether inherent power under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code could be exercised to quash criminal proceedings on the basis of a compromise entered into between the parties, even if the accused had been held guilty and convicted by the trial court. It was held in para 17 *that "the magnitude of inherent jurisdiction exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code is with a view to prevent the abuse of law or to secure the ends of Justice, however, is wide enough to include its power to quash the proceedings in relation to not only the non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under section 320 criminal procedure code but such a power, in our considered view, is exercisable at any stage save that there is no express bar and invoking such power is fully justified on facts and circumstances of the case."* After ascertaining the genuineness of the compromise between the parties and the settlement agreed upon, the Division Bench allowed the appeal preferred and set aside the conviction.

8. Similar is the case in hand. The parties have compromised the matter after conviction. To secure the ends of justice and in the interest of all concerned, this is a fit case to invoke inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C and quash the FIR registered against the petitioners.

9. Therefore, the application is allowed and FIR No. 9 dated 4.2.2014 (Annexure P/1) registered under Sections 354/354-A/354-

D/509/500 IPC at Police Station Sandaur, District Sangrur, and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed. The impugned judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 18.2.2017 passed by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Malerkotla, vide which the petitioners have been convicted and sentenced for the offence under Sections 354-D, 354-A, 354, 509 and 500 IPC for a period of 2 years are set aside on the basis of the compromise.

24.9.2018
prem

(JAISHREE THAKUR)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes
No