

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

CRM-M-30761 of 2019

DATE OF DECISION :- February 04, 2020

Chander Bhatia and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE H.S. MADAAN

Present:- Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Rana Harjasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Harsimran Singh, Advocate
for Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate for respondent No. 3.

H.S. MADAAN, J. (Oral)

Petitioners – Chander Bhatia and others have brought the instant petition under Section 482 Cr.PC. for quashing of FIR No. 123 dated 28.12.2009 for offences under Sections 323/324/452/148/149 IPC and Section 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1954 registered at Police Station, Pojewal, District Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, against them, along with consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise, stated to have been effected between them and complainant Ranjit Singh- arrayed as respondent No. 3 and injured Harjinder Singh arrayed as respondent No. 2.

When the petition came up for hearing on 22.7.2019, notice of motion was ordered to be issued. Respondent No. 1 - State of Punjab through State counsel, whereas respondent No.3 through Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate had put in appearance. Then in light of the contention that parties have since effected

compromise, they were directed to put in appearance before the trial Court/Area Judicial Magistrate to get their statements recorded with regard to compromise and was directed to send a report to this Court.

Report has been received from Sessions Judge, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, in terms of which complainant Ranjit Singh, injured Harjinder Singh and accused, namely, Chander Bhatia, Amit Kumar @ Sethi, Bikram Kumar @ Vicky, Vijay Kumar @ Ghela and Om Parkash, had appeared there and their statements were recorded, in terms of which they have admitted to have entered into a voluntary compromise, without any fear and inducement. Further, the complainant and the injured have stated that they have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed by this Court. There is nothing on record to doubt the genuineness of the compromise so arrived at between the parties. Along with the report statement of the complainant and all the accused, have been annexed.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties besides going through the record.

The petitioners and the complainant belong to the same village and they want to live in peace and harmony in future. The charge for offences under Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act had not been framed. The cross version in the form of private complaint has already been quashed by a coordinate Bench of this Court vide order passed in CRM-M-30807 of 2019 on 26.11.2019.

The dispute between the parties has been resolved amicably, which appears to have been arrived at between them voluntarily without any threat or coercion and in terms of ratio of the authority reported as **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and others** 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, where in para 28, it has been held as under :-

“The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of

harmony and orderly behaviour. It is the soul of justice and if the power under Section 482 of the Cr.PC. is used to enhance such a compromise which, in turn, enhances the social amity and reduces friction, then it truly is “finest hour of justice”.

It has been observed that High Court has power to quash prosecution in order to achieve ends of justice and to prevent abuse of process of law. Though such powers are unlimited but those are to be exercised sparingly and with utmost care and caution. Though there is no statutory bar which can effect the inherent power of High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

The compromise is in interest of peace and tranquility in the society and for such like reasons this Court can quash the FIR and ancillary proceedings exercising power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., it appears to be a fit case to exercise such powers.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the above said FIR along with ancillary proceedings are hereby quashed.

(H.S. MADAAN)
JUDGE

February 04, 2020
p.singh

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No