

CRM-M-55911-2023
Date of decision: 14.12.2023

Arjan Singh and othersPetitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Akshay Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. Deepak Arora, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Navreet Kaur Barnala, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jaswinder Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR, J. (ORAL)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of FIR No.118 dated 17.07.2008 under Sections 452/323/324/148/149 of Indian Penal Code (Section 326 of IPC added later on) registered at Police Station, Dhariwal, District Gurdaspur (Annexure P-1) along with all subsequent and consequential proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 22.08.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. The FIR has been registered on the statement of complainant-Tarjinder Singh on the allegations that the wife of petitioner No.1 was contesting Panchayat elections and accused-petitioners have developed ill-will with the complainant and his family members as they had supported Kuljeet Kaur wife of Ajit Singh, while casting their votes, who was the opposition party in the Panchayat Elections. Now with the intervention of respectable persons,

CRM-M-55911-2023

-2-

the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties and they have resolved their disputes and differences, in proof of which, affidavit (Annexure P-2) is annexed with the present petition.

3. Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the trial Court/Area Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report dated 20.11.2023 has been received from the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gurdaspur, stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

4. The learned State counsel on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for the complainant-respondent No.2 admit the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the FIR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

6. In a decision, based on compromise, a compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society. After considering the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, continuance of criminal prosecution would be an exercise in futility, as the chances of ultimate conviction are bleak. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Shakunta Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63,***

speaking through Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer, has held as under:-

“4.*The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.....*”

7. Consequently, keeping in view the fact that the dispute has been amicably settled and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466 and Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834** and Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (Crl.) 1052**, this petition is allowed and FIR No.118 dated 17.07.2008 under Sections 452/323/324/148/149 of Indian Penal Code (Section 326 of IPC added later on) registered at Police Station, Dhariwal, District Gurdaspur (Annexure P-1) along with all subsequent and consequential proceedings arising out of the same are hereby quashed *qua* petitioners.

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

14.12.2023
Neha

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No