

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

Sr. No.116+235

CRM-33372-2022 in/and
CRM-M-17187-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 17.02.2023

Gurmeet Singh

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA

Present: Mr. M.S.Hundal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harpreet Singh, Addl. A.G.Punjab.

Mr. Rahul Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. Dhruv Khanna, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA, J. (ORAL)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.52 dated 28.06.2018, registered under Sections 384, 354-D, 506, 509 of IPC, Section 67 of IT Act and Section 4 of Indecent Representation of Women (Prohibition) Act, 1986, at PS Lakho Ke Behram, District Ferozepur (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, in view of the compromise deed/statement, dated 11.04.2022, of the complainant and victim (Annexure P-2),

2. Keeping in view the fact that the parties had entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for getting their statements recorded in that regard, vide order dated 22.09.2022. Pursuant thereto, a report dated 04.10.2022 has been received from Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Guruharsahai, at Flag 'A', stating that the

compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure, coercion or undue influence.

3. Learned State counsel and learned counsel appearing on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3 admit the factum of compromise, and submit that they have no objection to quashing of the FIR on that basis.

4. It has been held by the Supreme Court of India in cases *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another*, 2012(10) SCC 303 and *Narinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another*, 2014(6) SCC 466, that criminal cases having overwhelmingly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or matrimonial relationships or family disputes, should be quashed when the parties have resolved their disputes among themselves in a *bona fide* manner by entering into a compromise. On similar lines is another judgment of the Supreme Court in *Shiji v. Radhika*, 2012 (1) SCC (Criminal) 101, wherein criminal proceedings for offences under Sections 354 and 394 IPC were quashed since the parties had entered into a compromise and there were no chances of conviction.

5. Further, reference can also be made to Full Bench judgment of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another*, 2007(3) R.C.R.(Criminal) 1052, wherein it has been held that on the parties settling their disputes by way of a compromise the High Court in exercise of power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. can allow the compounding of non-compoundable offences also, and quash the prosecution to prevent abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. The power is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

6. A perusal of the allegations in the FIR as well as the aforesaid report establishes that the present case falls in the category of cases that can be quashed by the High Court in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C., as per law laid down in the aforementioned judgments.

The terms of the compromise (Annexure P-2) show that the victim has admitted that she and the petitioner had love affair for the last five to six years. Only when their parents came to know about it, they filed a complaint leading to lodging of the FIR in question. She wanted to get married to the petitioner, but her family did not agree to it. Now, she is married to someone else and happily staying with her husband. In these facts and circumstances, she agreed to quashing of the FIR in question by recording that she has no grudges against the petitioner.

Since disputes between the parties have been amicably resolved by way of the compromise, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility, as chances of ultimate conviction are not there.

7. Consequently, this petition is allowed. FIR No.52 dated 28.06.2018, registered under Sections 384, 354-D, 506, 509 of IPC, Section 67 of IT Act and Section 4 of Indecent Representation of Women (Prohibition) Act, 1986, at PS Lakho Ke Behram, District Ferozepur, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioner.

(TRIBHUVAN DAHIYA)
JUDGE

17.02.2023
Maninder

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