

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

**CRM-M-20425 of 2022
Date of Decision: 5.8.2022**

Sunil and another

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Mr. Deepak Kundu, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Gurmeet Singh, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Piyush, Advocate for respondents No. 2 and 3.

AVNEESH JHINGAN , J.(Oral)

This petition under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 144 dated 3.8.2017, under Sections 323, 34, 341, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Pillu Khera (Section 325 IPC added later on) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

The FIR was at the instance of Bijender. As per the allegations, on 2.8.2017, Sunil along with co-accused inflicted injuries to the complainant. The complainant ran, he was followed by the accused and given beatings by wooden sticks.

The parties with the intervention of respectables have compromised the matter.

On 12.5.2022, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial court for getting their statements recorded with regard to compromise.

The report dated 25.5.2022 is received stating that the compromise is genuine, voluntary, without any coercion or undue influence. Further that there are two accused (petitioners herein) and they have not been declared as proclaimed offender.

Full Bench of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*, has held:-

“There is no statutory bar in Cr.P.C. which affects inherent power of this Court under Section 482. The power of quashing is not limited to matrimonial cases alone.”

The Supreme Court in *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another, 2017 AIR (SC) 4843* laid down the broad principles governing the exercises of powers of quashing of FIR. It was held that the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is to be exercised by the High Court to secure the ends of justice, to prevent abuse of any process of law and in cases where in view of the compromise the possibility of conviction is remote and continuation of proceeding will cause oppression and prejudice.

With the passage of time, better sense has prevailed. With the intervention of friends and relatives, the parties have decided to forget and forgive and to save their relations to an extent possible. No useful purpose would be served by continuing with the trial. Due to compromise, there are bleak chances of conviction. To meet the ends of justice, the FIR mentioned above and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

The petition is allowed.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

5.8.2022
mk

Whether reasoned/speaking	Yes
Whether reportable	Yes