

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

237

CRM-M-58888-2022 (O&M)

Date of order: 06.10.2023

Gurmeet Singh

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Haryana & Another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Pankaj Bali, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Ms. Deep Shikha Chauhan, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Raghav Bali, Advocate for
Mr. Ankit Aggarwal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Nidhi Gupta, J.

The prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.84 dated 19.02.2021 under Sections 323, 377, 506, 406 and 498-A IPC registered at Police Station Indri, Karnal and chargesheet order dated 09.12.2021 (Annexure P2) and all subsequent proceedings arising from the above said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 29.06.2022 (Annexure P-3) arrived at between the parties.

Vide order dated 16.12.2022 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 16.12.2022 with regard to the compromise dated 29.06.2022 (Annexure P-3).

In terms of the order dated 16.12.2022 passed by this Court parties have appeared before the Court of learned Illaqa Magistrate/Sub-Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Indri and as per her report dated 01.02.2023 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 the petitioner 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. Although statement of complainant/respondent No.2 is not annexed with report dated 01.02.2023 received by this Court, however, the said report states that "*Statements of the parties i.e., complainant/victim Pooja Rani and **accused** namely Gurmeet @ Sonu were recorded*". In any event, learned counsel for the parties admit the factum of compromise and are ad idem that parties are living together amicably.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has further submitted that the petitioner was not declared proclaimed offender in the present case. It is further submitted that petitioner and respondent No.2/complainant have started living together as husband and wife.

Learned State Counsel has stated that she 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 the petitioner 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 proceedings 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.84 dated 19.02.2021 under Sections 323, 377, 506, 406 and 498-A IPC registered at Police Station Indri, Karnal and chargesheet order dated 09.12.2021 (Annexure P2) along with all other subsequent proceedings arising from the aforesaid FIR, on the basis of compromise, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

Petition stands disposed of.

Pending application(s) if any also stand(s) disposed of.

06.10.2023

Sunena

(Nidhi Gupta)

Judge

**Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable**

**Yes/No
Yes/No**