

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-49510-2017
DATE OF DECISION :- 20.03.2018

Satmeheet Singh @ Raja Oberoi and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present:- Mr. Gagandeep Singh Virk, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rakeshinder Singh Sidhu, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Abhishek Bajaj, Advocate,
for respondent no.2.

Satmeheet Singh @ Raja Oberoi and others have brought the instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 151 dated 31.10.2017, for offences under Sections 326, 323, 341, 379, 506, 148 and 149 IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.3, Ludhiana, against them, alongwith consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise, stated to have been effected between them and complainant Anuj Kumar - arrayed as respondent No.2.

When the petition came up for hearing on 22.12.2017, notice of motion was ordered to be issued. The respondent No. 1 - State of Punjab through State counsel, whereas respondent No.2 through Mr. Abhishek Bajaj, 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 1st Class, Ludhiana, through District & Sessions Judge, Ludhiana in terms of which complainant Anuj Kumar and all accused persons, namely, Satmeet Singh @ Raja Oberoi, Bakshish Singh, Amarjit Kaur @ Sweety, Nayan Takkar @ Hunter Takkar, Chetan Gupta @ Chetan Shah, Akashdeep Singh @ Mangi, Harmandeep Singh, Manish Bhatt @ Gogi and Gurmit Singh @ Billa 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 has stated that he has 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. Alongwith the report, statement of the complainant and all the accused, in original, have been annexed.

I have heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned State counsel, besides going through the record.

The dispute between the parties has been resolved amicably, which appears to have been done voluntarily without any threat or coercion. In the authority reported as **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others** 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, 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.

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

20.03.2018

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No