

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

272

**CRM-M-46206-2022
Decided on :14.02.2023**

Jarnail Singh @ Bawa and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

PRESENT: Mr. H. S. Deol, Advocate for
Mr. P. B. S. Goraya, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kamalpreet Bawa, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. K. B. S. Mann, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

Present petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No. 55, dated 01.06.2014, under Sections 308, 325, 323, 357, 341, 148 and 149 IPC registered at Police Station Valtaha, District Tarn Taran and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise (Annexure P-2).

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the injuries caused were on the non vital part and simple in nature including the injuries caused on the head except few injuries which were non vital part and grievous. He further submits that the petitioners and the complainant are neighbors and have therefore settled the matter. The complaint registered at the hands of the the petitioners against the complainant wherein they have suffered injuries and complaint dated 30.08.2016 under Section 325, 326, 382, 323, 324, 148 and 149 IPC was also quashed by way of compromise by this Court vide order dated 30.01.2023 in CRM-M-50276-2022.

Learned counsel for the complainant affirms the aforesaid factum of

amicable compromise and has no objection to quashing of the FIR.

Notice of motion was issued on 10.10.2022 and both the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court for recording their statements in the context of genuineness of the compromise. The trial Court was also directed to submit its report with regard to genuineness of the compromise.

Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 26.10.2022 has been received from the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Chandigarh. A perusal of the said report reveals that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the present case, who have stated that the matter has been settled between the parties and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed and the compromise effected between them is genuine, without any undue influence and coercion. It is stated in the report that there are five accused. They have not been declared as proclaimed offender and are not involved in any other FIR.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have also gone through the case file.

The Full Bench of this Court in “***Kulwinder Singh and others Vs State of Punjab***”, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, 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 view that the same was 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 the Supreme Court of India in the case of “***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another***”, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543, had 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 reads thus:-

“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. XXX---XXX”

In view of the judgments referred to above, perusing the report of the trial Court regarding amicable settlement between the petitioner(s) and the complainant(s), this Court finds that quashing the FIR will accord a quietus to all disputes between the parties and it is in the interest of both sides to bury the hatchet and lead a peaceful life. Thus, no useful purpose would be served in continuing the proceedings and in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings in the present case deserve to be quashed.

Resultantly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No. 55, dated 01.06.2014, under Sections 308, 325, 323, 357, 341, 148 and 149 IPC registered at Police Station Valtoha, District Tarn Taran and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise (Annexure P-2), are quashed qua the petitioners.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

14.02.2023

Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No