

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

CRM-M-50663 of 2019

Date of decision: 15th September, 2023

Mohinder Singh and another

Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Kiran Kumar Madan, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Jashanpreet Singh, DAG, Punjab.
Mr. Surinder Sharma, 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. 32 dated 16.3.2019, under Section 420 IPC, registered at Police Station Navi Baradari, District Jalandhar and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.
2. As per the allegations in the FIR, the complainant purchased three marlas land from petitioner No. 2, the Power of Attorney of land was with her grand father-Mohinder Singh (petitioner No. 1). Later it revealed that the land did not belong to petitioner No. 2 and the amount was not returned to the complainant.
3. On 3.8.2023, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial court for getting their statements recorded with regard to compromise.
4. The report dated 18.8.2023 is received stating that the compromise is genuine, voluntary, without any coercion or undue influence and that there are two accused (petitioners herein) and none of them has been declared as proclaimed offender.
5. 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.”

6. 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.

7. The dispute has a pre-dominant tone and tenor of commercial transaction. The grievance was that the money was not returned. 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.

8. The petition is allowed.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

15th September, 2023
mk

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