

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

236-CRR-1773-2017

Date of Decision: 07.12.2022

Anju Bala

... Petitioner

VS.

Bharat Bhushan (through LRs)

... Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: None

Sandeep Moudgil, J. (Oral)

This criminal revision petition is directed against the judgment and order dated 19.12.2014 passed by Id. JMIC, Sri Muktsar Sahib convicting and sentencing the petitioner for commission of offence under Section 138 of Negotiable Instruments Act, and judgment dated 10.04.2017 passed by Id. Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, dismissing the appeal against the judgment of conviction.

During the pendency of the present revision petition, the parties have compromised the matter and in this regard CRM-17781-2022 was filed in view of the compromise. Vide order dated 14.07.2022, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court for report with regard to the genuineness of the compromise.

The report dated 20.08.2022 has been received from learned JMIC, Sri Muktsar Sahib stating that the parties have entered into a compromise without any undue influence or pressure. There is no representation on behalf of respondent which shows respondent has no objection to the quashing of complaint.

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

“The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in noncompoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined para-meters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and everlasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.”

The legal principles as laid down for quashing of the judgment were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '***Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another, (2012) 10 SCC 303***' .

Furthermore, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section

482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '*Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another*' (2017) 9 SCC 641'.

It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be wastage of judicial time as there appears to be no chances of conviction.

In view of above, prayer made in the present petition is allowed and the Complaint No.92 dated 21.05.2011 under Section 138 of the NI Act along with all subsequent proceedings including the judgment and order dated 19.12.2014 passed by ld. JMIC, Sri Muktsar Sahib and judgment dated 10.04.2017 passed by ld. Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioner, in view of the compromise.

07.12.2022

V.Vishal

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?
2. Whether reportable?

(Sandeep Moudgil)
Judge

Yes/No
Yes/No