

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16353-2019

Date of Decision:-17.05.2019.

Pardeep Bali @ Pardeep Kumar Bali and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI

Present: Mr. Deshpreet Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ajeet Pal Singh Pakka, Advocate for respondent No.2.

RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI, J.

By invoking Section 482 Cr.P.C., the petitioner has prayed for quashing of DDR No.29 dated 28.11.2017 under Sections 354, 354-B, 323, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Canal Colony, Bathinda and proceedings emanating therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

In the present case, the FIR was registered on the statement of Parminder Kaur, wife of Charanjeet Singh. Now, dispute between the parties has been resolved by way of compromise Annexure P-2.

Vide order dated 10.04.2019, 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 Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Bathinda wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been recorded and they have voluntarily compromised the matter, without any coercion or pressure.

Counsel for the State and respondent No.2 have not disputed that the parties i.e. petitioners and respondent No.2 (complainant) 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 the 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, DDR No.29 dated 28.11.2017 under Sections 354, 354-B, 323, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Canal Colony, Bathinda and proceedings emanating therefrom stand quashed qua the petitioners.

(RAJ SHEKHAR ATTRI)
JUDGE

May 17, 2019.
sandeep

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes / No

Whether Reportable:-

Yes / No.