

114

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-46065-2022 in/and
CRM-M-30095-2019
DECIDED ON: 6th DECEMBER, 2022

RAJ KUMAR JUNEJA

PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Ms. Kamlesh, Advocate for
Mr. Parminder Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sukhdeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

CRM-46065-2022

Prayer in the present application is for preponing the date of
hearing in the main petition, which is listed for 05.01.2023.

Application is allowed, as prayed for.

The main case is preponed from 05.01.2023 to today i.e.
06.12.2022.

CRM-M-30095-2019

The instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed
for quashing of FIR No. 36, dated 14.01.2019 (Annexure P-1), under
Sections 420, 406 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Ghraunda,
District Karnal and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the
basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

During the pendency of the dispute, the parties have compromised the matter and filed the present petition for quashing of FIR.

Vide order dated 13.11.2019 parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court for recording of their statements with regard to the genuineness of the compromise.

The report dated 21.12.2019 has been received from learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Karnal stating that the parties have entered into a compromise voluntarily, which is genuine and without any pressure.

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 a waste of judicial time and there appears to be no chances of conviction.

In view of above, the present petition is allowed and the above mentioned FIR (Annexure P-1) with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner in view of compromise (Annexure P-2).

SANDEEP MOUDGIL
JUDGE

6th DECEMBER, 2022.
sham

- | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|
| 1. Whether speaking/ reasoned : | Yes / No |
| 2. Whether reportable : | Yes / No |