

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

**CRM-M-38633 of 2017
Date of Decision: February 23, 2018**

Jaswant Singh @ Bittu and anotherPetitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and Others.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:Mr.M.J.S.Bedi,Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr.Abheypal Singh, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab

Mr. Bhanu Pratap Singh, 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. 12 dated 14.1.2016 under Sections 324, 323,148,149 (Section 325 IPC added lateron) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) registered at Police Station Dayalpura, Bathinda District Bathinda (Annexure P1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 3.8.2017 (Annexure P2) .

Vide order dated 7.12.2017, a direction was given to the trial Court 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

11.1.2018 (forwarded by the District and Sessions Judge Bathinda dated 12.1.2018), after recording the statements of the parties. The trial Court has submitted that the complainant-Gurpreet Singh, Sikander Singh and accused- Jaswant Singh @ Bittu and Lovepreet Singh @ Laddu 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. This fact is not disputed by learned State Counsel, who has submitted, on instructions from Assistant Sub Inspector-Iqbal Singh, that none of 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. 12 dated 14.1.2016 under Sections 324, 323, 148, 149 (Section 325 IPC added lateron) 'IPC' registered at Police Station Dayalpura, Bathinda District Bathinda (Annexure P1) along with all the consequential proceedings, arising

therefrom, are ordered to be quashed by way of compromise subject to paying costs in the sum of ₹ 10,000/- in the Office of District Legal Services Authority, Bathinda within 8 weeks from today, failing which this order shall stand recalled automatically without reference to the Court.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

February 23, 2018
arya

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