

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.8545 of 2023
Reserved on: 10.04.2023
Pronounced on: 24.04.2023

Shamshad Begum and anotherPetitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and anotherRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Surinder Garg, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. I.P.S. Sabharwal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Lalit Chander Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

ANOOP CHITKARA J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
50	18.04.2019	City-1, Malerkotla, District Sangrur	419 and 420 IPC

The petitioners, arraigned as accused in the above captioned FIR, have come up before this Court under Section 482 CrPC for quashing of the FIR and all consequential proceedings based on the compromise with the aggrieved person.

2. During the pendency of the petition, the accused and the aggrieved person have compromised the matter, and its copy is annexed with this petition as Annexure P-2.

3. After that, the petitioners came up before this Court to quash the FIR, and in the quashing petition, impleading the aggrieved person as respondent.

4. This court had asked the parties to appear before the concerned court and had asked the said court to give its report as per the format. The report reads as follows:

Name of the reporting Court	SDJM, Malerkotla, District Sangrur
-----------------------------	------------------------------------

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
50	18.04.2019	City-1, Malerkotla, District Sangrur	419 and 420 IPC

Criminal Case no. before trial Court	CHI/223/2021 Registration No.CHI/42/2021, CNR No.PBSGC1-000223-2021
---	---

1.	Names of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s)	Mohd. Ramzan
2.	Dates on which the statement(s) of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s) were recorded	13.03.2023
3.	Has the identity of the complainant/ victims(s)/ aggrieved persons(s) been verified?	Yes
4.	Whether all the victims/ all the aggrieved persons have compromised the matter?	Yes
5.	Is there pressure, threat, or coercion upon the victim(s)/aggrieved person(s)/complainant?	No
6.	Names of the accused person(s)	Shamshad Begum and Liaqat Ali
7.	Dates on which the statement(s) of the accused persons(s) recorded	13.03.2023
8.	Whether all the accused have compromised the matter? If no, then the names of the accused who have compromised.	Yes
9.	Whether proclamation proceedings are pending against any accused?	No
10.	Has the police report been filed or not?	Yes
11.	Notice of accusation /Charges have been framed or not?	No
12.	Sections of statutes invoked in the matter	419 and 420 IPC
13.	Whether the court is satisfied with the genuineness of the compromise?	Yes

ANALYSIS & REASONING:

5. Despite the opposition of the State’s counsel to this compromise, the following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition. In the present case, all the offences are compoundable under Section 320 CrPC. Given the legislative mandate, the prosecution can be closed by quashing the FIR and consequent proceedings.
6. In Shakuntala Sawhney v Kaushalya Sawhney, (1979) 3 SCR 639, at P 642, Hon’ble Supreme Court observed that the finest hour of Justice arises propitiously when parties, who fell apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.
7. In the light of the judicial precedents referred to above, given the terms of compromise, placement of parties, and other factors peculiar to the case, the contents of the compromise

deed and its objectives point towards its acceptance.

8. In Himachal Pradesh Cricket Association v State of Himachal Pradesh, 2018 (4) Crimes 324, Hon’ble Supreme Court holds “[47]. As far as Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 135 of 2017 is concerned, the appellants came to this Court challenging the order of cognizance only because of the reason that matter was already pending as the appellants had filed the Special Leave Petitions against the order of the High Court rejecting their petition for quashing of the FIR/Chargesheet. Having regard to these peculiar facts, writ petition has also been entertained. In any case, once we hold that FIR needs to be quashed, order of cognizance would automatically stands vitiated.”

9. Considering the entire facts, compromise, and in the light of the above-mentioned judicial precedents, I believe that continuing these proceedings will not suffice any fruitful purpose whatsoever. In the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the Court invokes the inherent jurisdiction under section 482 CrPC and quashes the FIR and all subsequent proceedings qua the petitioner(s). The bail bonds of the petitioners are accordingly discharged. All pending application(s), if any, stand closed.

Petition allowed in the terms mentioned above.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)
JUDGE

24.04.2023
Jyoti-II

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
Whether reportable:	No.