

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH
CRM-M-38501-2019
DECIDED ON: 06.09.2022**

JAGIR SINGH**.....PETITIONER****VERSUS****STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS****.....RESPONDENTS****CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.**

Present: Mr. S.S. Sandhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur Bhatti, Advocate for
Mr. Nitin Thatai, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.24, dated 17.02.2014 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station P.S. Mattaur Distirct S.A.S. Nagar, Mohali, with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of settlement/closure letter (Annexure P-2 & P-4).

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

Vide order dated 28.01.2020, 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 16.08.2022 has been received from learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, SAS Nagar, stating that the parties have entered into a compromise without any threat or coercion or undue influence or pressure of any kind.

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 ever- lasting 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.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon a judgment of Delhi High Court rendered in *Mrs. Poonam Khanna V. State and others, 2018 (2) AD (Delhi) 372*: wherein partially FIR on the basis of compromise has been allowed in the identical circumstances.

In view of above, the present petition is allowed and the above mentioned FIR dated 17.02.2014 (Annexure P-1) with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner, in view of settlement/closure letter (Annexure P-2 & P-4).

It is, however, made clear that the present FIR stands quashed on the basis of settlement/closure letter qua only Jagir Singh petitioner herein partially as there are total five accused involved in the present FIR.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

06.09.2022

Monika

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No