

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

Decided on: 16.07.2019

1. CRM-M No.7908 of 2019

Rakesh Kumar @ Sokha and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

2. CRM-M No.12416 of 2019

Chaman Lal and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present : Mr. Siddharth Sharma, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CRM-M-7908-2019)
and for respondents No.2 to 4 (in CRM-M-12416-2019)

Mr. R.P. Dangi, Advocate
for Mr. Digvijay Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CRM-M-12416-2019)

Mr. Jagmohan Ghumman, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sanjiv Kumar, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 7 (in CRM-M-7908-2019)

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

By way of this order, I shall dispose of aforesaid petitions as they emerged from FIR No.24 dated 02.04.2016, registered under Sections 323, 452 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short 'IPC') and Rapat/DDR No.26 dated 02.04.2016 registered under Section 323 IPC at Police Station Bholath, District Kapurthala being version and cross-version.

In both the cases, vide orders dated 21.02.2019 and dated 18.03.2019, the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate was directed to record the statements of the parties and send its report with regard to genuineness of the compromise effected between the parties.

In pursuance to the said order, the trial Court after recording the statements of the parties, has reported on 14.03.2019 and on 14.06.2019 that the parties have appeared through their respective counsels representing them in the trial Court and that the compromise effected between the parties was voluntarily and without any coercion, pressure.

Counsel for the petitioners submits that no other criminal case is pending between the parties and none of the petitioner is a proclaimed offender.

This fact is not disputed by counsel for the State assisted by counsel for the private respondents.

I have heard counsel for the parties, perused the paperbook and the report submitted by the trial Court.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***“Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab”*, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, it is held that 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 feel that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

Perusal of the 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 if the criminal proceedings are put to an end.

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.

In view of the above, the petitions are allowed. FIR No.24 dated 02.04.2016, registered under Sections 323, 452 and 506 IPC and Rapat/DDR No.26 dated 02.04.2016 registered under Section 323 IPC in FIR No.24 dated 02.04.2016 at Police Station Bholath, District Kapurthala along with all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed subject to payment of costs of Rs.3,000/- each (in both the petitions) to be deposited with the District Legal Services Authority Kapurthala.

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

16.07.2019
yakub

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No