

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-39814-2022

Date of decision:23.09.2022

Parveen and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sandeep Yadav, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Dhruv Sihag, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Manoj Dhankhar, Advocate for

Mr. Nitish Yadav, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

It has been brought to the notice of this Court that Section 452 IPC has wrongly been typed as Section 352 IPC in the head note of the petition. Therefore, an oral request has been made by learned counsel for the petitioners to replace Section 352 IPC with Section 452 IPC in the head note of the petition.

The above said request of learned counsel for the petitioners is allowed and Section 352 IPC is ordered to be replaced with Section 452 IPC in the head note of the present petition. The Registry is directed to carry out the necessary correction at the appropriate places.

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.521 dated 09.11.2021, registered under Sections 323,

452, 506 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Beri, District Jhajjar (Annexure P-1) along with all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise..

On 02.09.2022, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.521 dated 09.11.2021, registered under Sections 323, 352, 506 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Beri, District Jhajjar and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that all the persons concerned are party to the compromise.

Notice of motion for 23.09.2022.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Parveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Nitish Yadav, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 and admits the factum of compromise.

The parties are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements qua compromise within a period of 15 days.

The Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court is directed to submit a report on or before the next date of hearing containing the following information:-

- 1. Number of persons arrayed as accused.*
- 2. Whether any accused is proclaimed offender?*
- 3. Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence?*
- 4. Whether the accused persons are involved in any other FIR or not?*
- 5. The trial Court is also directed to record the statement of the Investigating Officer as to how many victims/complainants are there in the FIR.*

(VIKAS BAHL)

JUDGE”

September 02, 2022

In pursuance to the said order, a report has been submitted by Chief Judicial Magistrate, Jhajjar. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“In view of the statements of interested parties, this court is satisfied that they have compromised the matter amongst themselves voluntarily and without any pressure and

complainant has no objection, if the present proceedings are dropped against the accused persons.

As far as the information as sought by the Hon'ble High Court under point 1,3 & 4, it is submitted that in the present case only three accused persons namely Parveen, Rohit and Deepak (petitioners' before the Hon'ble High Court) have been booked and no proclamation proceedings are pending against any of the above said accused persons. It is further respectfully submitted that in this regard statement of IO has also been recorded who has stated that in this case except the accused namely Parveen, Rohit and Deepak, no other person has been booked as accused. He has also stated that no accused has been declared as proclaimed person in the present proceedings. He has also stated that in this case Pavitra is the only complainant and Hawa Singh is the only injured.

xxx xxx

xxx xxx

xxx xxx

xxx xxx

Submitted please,

*(Vinay Sharma)
Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Jhajjar”*

A perusal of the above said report would show that the petitioners and respondents No.2 & 3 have appeared and suffered statements with respect to the compromise, which have been found to be voluntary, genuine, and out of free will.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that the petitioners were not declared proclaimed offenders in the present case.

Learned State counsel has stated that he has no objection in case the FIR is quashed on the basis of compromise qua the petitioners.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3 has again reiterated that the matter has been settled and the said compromise is in the interest of all the persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the two parties.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the file.

After perusing the report submitted by the trial Court, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners and the complainant. Since the matter has been settled and the parties have decided to live in peace, this Court feels that in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings deserve to be quashed.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in “***Kulwinder Singh and others Vs State of Punjab***”, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, it is held that High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution where the High Court is of the opinion that the same is required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of “***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another***”, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543, had also observed that in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court, inherent power can be used by this Court to quash criminal proceedings in which a compromise has been effected. The relevant portion of para 57 of the said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“57. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court.”

In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, this petition is

452, 506 and 34 IPC, at Police Station Beri, District Jhajjar (Annexure P-1) along with all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.

23.09.2022

Ishwar

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No

(VIKAS BAHL)

JUDGE