

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM M No.9270 of 2017 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 25.04.2018.

Randhir and others

..Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Ms. Sharmila Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Brijesh Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Gagan Bajaj, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI J. (ORAL)

By invoking Section 482 Cr.P.C., the petitioners have prayed for quashing of Complaint case No.750 dated 27.08.2011/01.10.2013 for offence punishable under Sections 323, 452, 324, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station City Sonapat, District Sonapat and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of affidavit with regard to compromise dated 14.03.2017 (Annexures P-2) arrived at between the parties.

In the present case, complaint was filed by respondent No.2-Satya Pal against the petitioners. Now, dispute between the parties has been resolved by way of compromise dated 14.03.2017 (Annexures P-2).

Vide order dated 02.02.2018, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court to get their statements recorded with regard to genuineness of compromise.

Pursuant thereto, a report has been submitted by the Chief Judicial

Magistrate, Sonapat, wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been recorded that the compromise is genuine and valid one which has ex-facie has been entered into by the parties with their free volition, without any inducement or threat.

Counsel for the State as well as counsel for respondent No.2 have not disputed that the parties i.e. petitioners and respondent No.2 have arrived at a settlement with an intent to give burial to their differences.

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 Cr.P.C. Keeping in view authoritative enunciation of law laid down by Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **'Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another', 2012 (4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543** and in the light of facts and circumstances discussed hereinbefore, 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 the same are put to an end.

For the foregoing reasons, the petition is allowed. Complaint case No.750 dated 27.08.2011/01.10.2013 for offence punishable under Sections 323, 452, 324, 506, 34 of the Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station City Sonapat, District Sonapat and proceedings emanating therefrom stand quashed qua the petitioners.

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

April 25, 2018
rekha

whether speaking/reasoned
whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No