

CRM-8185-2024 in/and
CRM-M-2227-2023 (O&M)

1

2024:PHHC:026960

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

132

CRM-8185-2024 in/and
CRM-M-2227-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 26.02.2024

JASWANT SINGH AND OTHERSPetitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERSRespondents

CORAM : HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present :- Ms. Jasneet Mehra, Advocate for the applicants/petitioners.

Mr. Satjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Gurpreet Kaur, Advocate for
Ms. Rishma Verma, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 & 3.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

CRM-8185-2024

Prayer has been made by the petitioners for seeking preponement of hearing of the case. Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 & 3 is also present in Court. Learned State counsel as well as herself have stated that they have no objection if the prayer made in the application by the petitioners is allowed.

In view of fact and circumstances of the case as explained in the application, the same is allowed and hearing of the case is ordered to be pre-poned to be taken up today itself.

Main Case

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of FIR No.53 dated 09.04.2018 under Sections 323, 324, 452, 354 and 148 of IPC, 1860 registered at Police Station Division No.1, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 12.05.2022 (Annexure P-2).

2. The aforementioned FIR had been lodged by respondent No.2-complainant and investigation was commenced thereon.

3. It is submitted by counsel for the petitioners that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and they have resolved their *inter se* dispute, which was reduced into writing as compromise dated 12.05.2022 annexed with the present petition as Annexure P-2.

4. On the basis of said compromise, the petitioners have prayed for quashing of the aforesaid FIR and all the subsequent proceedings on the ground that continuation of such proceedings would be a futile exercise.

5. This Court vide order dated 17.01.2023 had directed the parties to appear before the trial Court/Duty Magistrate for recording their statements with regard to the genuineness of the compromise stated to have been arrived at between them. The trial Court/Duty Magistrate was also directed to send their report along with the said statements.

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, The Civil Judge, Junior Division, Jalandhar has sent report vide endorsement No.233 dated 10.02.2023 to this Court along with original statement of respondents and

statement of the petitioners recorded on 07.02.2023 and statement of Investigating Officer SI-Resham Singh recorded on 07.02.2023.

7. Report from the Civil Judge, Junior Division, Jalandhar has been received as per which the statement of the parties (except petitioner no.7- Lovejeet Singh) and the investigating officer have been recorded which is annexed with this petition.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the name of the petitioner no.7 who has been declared a proclaimed person may be deleted from the array of the parties.

In view of her statement, name of petitioner no.7 is ordered to be deleted from the array of the parties.

Amended memo of appearance has been filed. The same is taken on record.

8. On the basis of these statements, it is submitted by learned Magistrate that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, out of free Will and without any pressure or coercion. It is also mentioned in the report that apart from the petitioners, there is no other accused in the FIR and that the accused have not been declared proclaimed persons in this case.

9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and besides perusing the report by learned Judicial Magistrate, have also perused the record.

10. It is well settled that the High Court has power to allow compounding of a non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. where it feels that the same is required to

prevent the abuse of process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Such power is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone. In this regard, reference can be made to a Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***. It is equally settled position of law that the power of High Court in quashing criminal proceedings or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation. Such power can certainly be exercised in cases relating to offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. The High Court is required to consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate to put an end to the criminal case and if the answer to such question is in affirmative, then the High Court is well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings. Reference in this context can be made to Hon'ble Apex Court judgments cited as ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543*** and ***Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466***.

11. In view of the proposition as settled in the aforementioned cases, this Court finds that continuation of proceedings would be an abuse process of the Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case which squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents

and that allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioners by quashing of the FIR would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of legislature enacted under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.53 dated 09.04.2018 under Sections 323, 324, 452, 354, 148 of IPC registered at Police Station Division No.1, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua all the petitioners except petitioner No.7-Lovejeet Singh on the basis of compromise dated 12.05.2022 (Annexure P-2).

12. Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and statements as recorded before learned Judicial Magistrate.

26.02.2024

Deepak Patwal

(MANISHA BATRA)

JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO