

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

228

CRM-M-31007-2020

Date of Decision:14.12.2020

BARJINDER SHARMA

...PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUVIR SEHGAL

Present: Mr. Prateek Pandit, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Sarabjit Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nitin Rampal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUVIR SEHGAL, J.(ORAL)

The Court has been convened through video conferencing due to Covid-19 pandemic.

The instant petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.65 dated 01.03.2020 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 379, 406, 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties alongwith all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Vide order dated 05.10.2020, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise and a report was called for from the Court.

After recording the statements of the accused-petitioner and complainant-private respondent, the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kapurthala, has reported that the compromise in question is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. The Court has further reported that none of the accused have been declared as Proclaimed Offender.

State counsel, upon instructions from ASI Manjit Singh, submits that the petitioner is not involved in any other criminal case.

Supreme Court in *Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another*, 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543 has held that the High Court has wide power under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure to quash an FIR or complaint having predominantly civil flavour or involving matrimonial offences and family disputes wherein the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. The Full Bench of this Court in case *Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and another*, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and Division Bench of this Court in case *Sube Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and another*, 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102 held that compounding of offence can be allowed even after conviction, during pendency of the appeal and even in cases involving non-compoundable offences.

Counsel for the parties are also ad idem that in view of the settlement of the dispute between the parties, the present petition deserves to be accepted. In view of the above, no purpose will be served in continuing with the criminal proceedings.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed. FIR No.65 dated 01.03.2020 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 379, 406, 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala, and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioner.

14.12.2020
sheetal

(SUVIR SEHGAL)
JUDGE

Whether Speaking/Reasoned: Yes/No
Whether Reportable : Yes/No