

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 34312 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of decision : 14.3.2018

...

Vinkal and others

.....Petitioners

vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice H. S. Madaan

Present: Mr. Mohinder Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rakeshinder Singh Sidhu, Assistant Advocate General,
Punjab.

Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate for respondent No. 2 to 4.

...

H. S. Madaan, J. (Oral)

CRM-8600-2018

This is an application for addition of Sections 325 and 326

IPC in the head note and prayer clause of the petition.

Heard.

Allowed.

Registry is directed to make necessary amendments in the
head note and prayer clause.

Main case

Petitioners - Vinkal and others have brought the instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 113 dated 15.8.2017, for offences under Sections 323, 324, 506, 148, 149, 325, 326, IPC, registered at Police Station 'C' Division, Police Commissionerate Amritsar, District Amritsar. against them, alongwith consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise, stated to have been effected between them and complainant Surinder Singh and others- arrayed as respondents No.2 to 4.

When the petition came up for hearing on 15.9.2017, notice of motion was ordered to be issued. The respondent No. 1 - State of Punjab through State counsel, whereas respondents No.2 to 4 through Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advocate, had put in appearance. Then in light of the contention that parties have since effected compromise, they were directed to put in appearance before the trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to compromise and the trial Court was directed to send a report to this Court.

Report has been received from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Amritsar, in terms of which complainant Surinder Singh, Sandeep Singh and Hari Singh and accused, namely, Vinkal, Sahil Kapoor @ Vicky, Harsimran Singh, Rahul Sharma, Ranjit Singh @ Pamm, Pardeep @ Shiva, Raman Thakur @ Sam and Akash Jindal, had appeared there and their statements were recorded, in terms of which they have admitted to have entered into a voluntary

compromise, with free will, without any pressure, coercion or undue influence. Further complainant have stated that they have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed by this Court. There is nothing on record to doubt the genuineness of the compromise so arrived at between the parties. It has been reported that no accused has been declared proclaimed offender in the FIR in question. Alongwith the report copies of statements of the complainant party and accused party, have been annexed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, learned counsel for respondents No. 2 to 4, besides going through the record.

The dispute between the parties has been resolved amicably, which appears to have been arrived at between them voluntarily without any threat or coercion and in terms of ratio of the authority reported as **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others** 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, where in para 28, it has been held as under :-

“The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour. It is the soul of justice and if the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is used to enhance such a compromise which, in turn, enhances the social amity and reduces friction, then it truly is “*finest hour of justice*”.”

It has been observed that High Court has power to quash

prosecution in order to achieve ends of justice and to prevent abuse of process of law. Though such powers are unlimited but those are to be exercised sparingly and with utmost care and caution. Though there is no statutory bar which can effect the inherent power of High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

The compromise is in interest of peace and tranquility in the society and for such like reasons this Court can quash the FIR and ancillary proceedings exercising power under Section 482 Cr.P.C, it appears to be a fit case to exercise such powers.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the abovesaid FIR alongwith ancillary proceedings are hereby quashed.

14.3.2018
chugh

(H.S. Madaan)
Judge

Whether speaking / reasoned Yes / No

Whether reportable Yes / No