

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

238

CRM-M-41810-2021

Date of Decision: 24.11.2022

Manjit Kaur & Anr.

... Petitioners

VS.

State of Punjab & Anr.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Parminder Singh Kanwar, Advocate for the petitioners

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG Punjab

Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for respondent No.2

Sandeep Moudgil, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.44 dated 24.05.2015 under Sections 326/324/323/34 IPC registered at Police Station Chohla Sahib, District Tarn Taran (Annexure P1) and Criminal Complaint No.COMI/157 dated 18.10.2016 under Sections 326/324/323/34 IPC (Annexure P2) and the summoning orders dated 31.03.2018 passed by learned CJM, Tarn Taran vide which the petitioners have been ordered to be summoned to face trial for commission of offences under Sections 323/324/326 read with Section 34 IPC (Annexure P3) and all subsequent proceedings thereof, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P4).

During the pendency of the dispute, the parties have compromised the matter. Vide order dated 06.10.2021, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and for report with regard to the genuineness of the compromise.

The report dated 28.10.2021 has been received from learned CJM, Tarn Taran stating that the parties have entered into a compromise without any undue influence or pressure.

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 above mentioned FIR/criminal complaint with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioners in view of the compromise (Annexure P4).

Disposed off.

Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements made before the Court below.

24.11.2022

V.Vishal

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

(Sandeep Moudgil)
Judge

Yes/No
Yes/No