

CRM-31805-2023 in/and
CRM-M-19469-2023

-1-

2023:PHHC:102649

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

113

CRM-31805-2023 in/and
CRM-M-19469-2023

Date of Decision: 08.08.2023

Navjot Singh @ Navjot Singh Matharu

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. L.S. Sekhon, Advocate for
Mr. Jagmohan Ghumman, Advocate
for the applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Neeraj Jain, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

CRM-31805-2023

Prayer in this application filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is
for pre-poning the date of hearing in the main case from 04.09.2023 to an
early date.

Notice of the application to learned opposite counsel.

On the asking of Court, Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, AAG, Punjab,
accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1-State; whereas Mr. Neeraj
Jain, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2, and they
both submit that they have no objection, in case, the present application is
allowed.

In view of the above and for the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed and the date of hearing in the main petition is pre-poned from 04.09.2023 to today itself.

CRM-M-19469-2023

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing of FIR No. 0097 dated 07.11.2017 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Women, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise deed dated 24.03.2023 (Annexure P-2).

Pursuant to the order dated 20.04.2023 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, has submitted her report along with copies of the statements of the parties vide letter dated 24.07.2023 duly forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Ludhiana.

A perusal of the above said report would show that the petitioner and respondent No. 2 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 petitioner has submitted that as per report, petitioner is the only accused in the present FIR and he has never been declared as proclaimed offender.

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

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

After perusing the report submitted by the concerned Magistrate, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioner 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 proceedings 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 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 here-in-below:-

“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 allowed and FIR No. 0097 dated 07.11.2017 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Women, District Police Commissionerate, Ludhiana, along with all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

08.08.2023
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No