

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-39152 of 2017
Date of Decision: January 15, 2018

Satya Rani and others.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another.....Respondents

CORAM:HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present: Mr.Arn timer K. Sood,Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr.Knister Ganeriwala, Assistant Advocate General,Punjab
Mr.Abhinav Jain, Advocate for respondent No. 2

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. 2 dated 1.2.2015 under Sections 420,467,468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) registered at NRI Police Station Ludhiana City, (Annexure P1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise on 20.7.2017(Annexure P2) .

Vide order dated 14.11.2017, 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

29.11.2017 (forwarded by the District and Sessions Judge Ludhiana on 30.11.2017), after recording the statements of the parties. The trial Court has submitted that Anil Kumar, Attorney of the complainants-Anil Kumar Verma and Satpal Rajput and accused- Satya Rani, Surjit Jain and Ashok Verma 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 out of four persons who have been arrayed as accused, one Pritpal Singh had already died and none of them is proclaimed offender.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that there is a family dispute qua Will.

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. 2 dated

1.2.2015 under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B IPC registered at NRI Police Station Ludhiana City,(Annexure P1) and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners by way of compromise subject to the petitioners paying costs in the sum of ₹ 15,000/- in the Office of District Legal Services Authority, Ludhiana within 8 weeks from today, failing which this order shall stand recalled automatically without reference to the Court. .

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

January 15,2018
arya

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