

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

Crl. Misc. M 32704 of 2016 (O&M)

Date of decision: 11.2.2020

Nanak Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

**CORAM:- HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JAISHREE THAKUR**

Present: Mr. Chetan Bansal, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. S.S. Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

**JAISHREE THAKUR, J.**

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking for quashing of FIR No. 104 dated 8.05.2016 (Annexure P/1) registered under Section 366-A IPC at Police Station Jandiala, Amritsar Rural and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

2. The facts, in brief, are that petitioner No.1—Nanak Singh alias Ajay and Rajbir Kaur daughter of respondent No.2—complainant were known to each other and they fell in love and ultimately they got married on 5.5.2016 as per Sikh rites against the wishes of parents of Rajbir Kaur by running from her house. Consequently, respondent No.2 lodged the aforesaid FIR against the petitioners. In the meantime, after the marriage, petitioner No.1 and Rajbir Kaur approached this Court for protection of their life and liberty from the hands of respondent No.2 and other family members by way of filing Crl. Misc. M 16050 of 2016, which was allowed.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners

have been falsely implicated in the case as no offence is made out against them. Petitioner No.1 and daughter of respondent No.2 got married out of their sweet will and they are living happily and are enjoying the marriage without any threat or interference from anyone. It is argued that keeping in view the fact that petitioner No.1 and Rajbir Kaur are happily married, continuance of the proceedings under the FIR would amount to abuse of process of law.

4. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the documents.

5. In normal circumstances, the Court would not entertain a matter when offences are heinous in nature and against the public. In the instant case, the offence complained of is under Sections 366-A IPC which are offences of grave nature. In the eyes of law, the offence of kidnapping is serious and non-compoundable and the Courts should not in the ordinary circumstances interfere and quash the FIR registered. However, there are always exceptions to the normal rules and certain categories of cases, which deserve consideration specially when it is case of love affair between teenagers and on fear of the society and pressure from the community, one party alleges kidnapping. The cases where the accused and the victim are well known to each other, and allegation of kidnapping is levelled only because the marriage was performed against the wishes of the parents.

6. In the instant case, a complaint came to be made in which it was stated that accused-petitioner No.1 with the help of his sister—Pooja, petitioner No.2 herein had kidnapped and allured Priyanka with an intention to marry her.

7. In a judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(6) SCC 466***, the Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down certain principles and guidelines which should be kept in mind while quashing of FIRs pertaining to non-compoundable offence. For ready reference paragraphs No. 29.2 and 29.5 are reproduced as under :-

*“29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure :*

*(i) ends of justice, or*

*(ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.*

*While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.*

*29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case.”*

8. In a decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Cr.) 543**, the law on the point has been summed up. It has been laid down that the inherent power of quashing an FIR with the High Court is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation with the only requirement that it should be exercised to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of any court. It has also been laid down that before exercise of such power, the High Court must

have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Exception has been held to be there in cases of offences under special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity. It has been further held that in case the dispute is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their dispute, the criminal proceedings may be quashed. What has to be considered in this regard is the remote and bleak possibility of conviction.

9. Faced with the above situation, this Court deems it appropriate to quash the FIR as the continuance of the proceedings would only result in unnecessary harassment in the happy married life of petitioner No.1 and Rajbir Kaur, which would have its own serious consequences.

10. Consequently, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 104 dated 8.05.2016 (Annexure P/1) registered under Section 366-A IPC at Police Station Jandiala, Amritsar Rural and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

The petition stands disposed of.

**11.2.2020**

prem

**(JAISHREE THAKUR)**

**JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether reportable

No