

## IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB &amp; HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-43970-2021 (O&amp;M)

Date of order: 20.07.2023

Gurdip Singh &amp; Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Punjab &amp; Another

.....Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA**Present:- Mr. Jasraj Singh, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jashanpreet Singh, DAG Punjab.

Mr. Imran Ahmad Ali, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Nidhi Gupta, J.**

The prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.28 dated 15.03.2017 (Annexure **P-1**) under Section 498-A IPC (Section 406 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 19.07.2021 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Vide order dated 29.04.2023 this Court had directed the parties to appear before Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in terms of certain parameters given in the aforesaid order dated 29.04.2023 with regard to the compromise dated 19.07.2021 (Annexure P-2).

Learned counsel for the petitioners inter alia submits that vide order dated 12.11.2018, petitioner No.1 was declared proclaimed

offender. However, vide order dated 25.10.2021, this Court had stayed the operation of said order dated 12.11.2018. It is further submitted that father of petitioner No.1, Karnail Singh (petitioner No.2 herein) has since expired on 10.02.2022; and his mother, Gurpal Kaur (petitioner No.3 herein), faced trial and has been acquitted by learned trial Court vide order dated 19.04.2022.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 does not dispute all the above said facts.

Hence, in terms of the order dated 29.04.2023 passed by this Court parties have appeared before the Court of Ms. Parminder Kaur Bains, PCS, Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Dasuya and as per her report dated 01.07.2023 submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements in Court.

A perusal of the above said report would show that petitioner No.1 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 State Counsel has stated that he has no objection in case the FIR is quashed on the basis of compromise qua the petitioner.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has again reiterated that the matter has been settled and the said compromise is in the interest of all the persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the two parties.

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

After perusing the report submitted by the Illaqa Magistrate, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between petitioner No.1 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 prosecution 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 hereinbelow:-

*“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.28 dated 15.03.2017 (Annexure **P-1**) under Section 498-A IPC (Section 406 IPC added later on) registered at Police Station Dasuya, District Hoshiarpur along with all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise, are ordered to be quashed qua petitioner No.1.

Petition stands disposed of.

**20.07.2023**  
Sunena

**(Nidhi Gupta)**  
**Judge**

**Whether speaking/reasoned**  
**Whether reportable**

**Yes/No**  
**Yes/No**