

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

251

CRM-M-46409 of 2023
Date of decision: 20th October, 2023

Sumit		Petitioner
	Versus	
State of Haryana and another		Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Mohan Singla, Advocate for
Mr. MS Gahlawat, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Rajiv Sidhu, DAG, Haryana
Mr. Shivam, Advocate for
Mr. J.S. Thinda, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

1. This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 253 dated 22.4.2022 under Sections 406/420 IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station City Hisar, Haryana and all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise
2. As per the FIR, the accused took money for fees and gave fake roll numbers.
3. The parties with the intervention of respectables have compromised the matter.
4. On 15.9.2023, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial court for getting their statements recorded with regard to compromise.
5. The report dated 9.10.2023 is received stating that the compromise is genuine, voluntary, without any coercion or undue influence and there is one accused (petitioner herein) and he has not been declared as proclaimed offender.
6. 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.”

7. 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.

8. The parties are from the same locality. 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.

9. The petition is allowed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

20th October, 2023
anuradha

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