

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

224

CRM-M-23439 of 2023
Date of decision: 6th October, 2023

Rakesh Sharma @ Rakesh Kumar @ Rakesh Vats and another

Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Sandeep Berwal, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. KS Bal, Advocate for the complainant.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 0290 dated 2.7.2020, under Sections 323/506 IPC, 1860 (Section 201 and 327 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Sector 32, 33 Urban Estate Karnal and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.
2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the petitioners were forcing the private respondents to transfer the property which led to an altercation and injuries were inflicted.
3. On 9.5.2023, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial court for getting their statements recorded with regard to compromise.
4. The report dated 20.9.2023 is received stating that the

compromise is genuine, voluntary, without any coercion or undue influence and that there are two accused (petitioners herein) and none of them has been declared as proclaimed offender.

5. Full Bench of this Court in *Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*, has held:-

“There is no statutory bar in Cr.P.C. which affects inherent power of this Court under Section 482. The power of quashing is not limited to matrimonial cases alone.”

6. The Supreme Court in *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another, 2017 AIR (SC) 4843* laid down the broad principles governing the exercise of powers for quashing of FIR. It was held that the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is to be exercised by the High Court to secure the ends of justice, to prevent abuse of any process of law and in cases where in view of the compromise the possibility of conviction is remote and continuation of proceeding will cause oppression and prejudice.

7. The dispute has a pre-dominant tone and tenor of commercial transaction. The parties have settled the differences and decided not to litigate any further. No useful purpose would be served by continuing with the trial. To meet the ends of justice, the FIR mentioned above and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

8. The petition is allowed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

6th October, 2023
anuradha

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes / No
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes / No