

CRM-M-6019-2024

-1-

2024:PHHC:068610



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

228

CRM-M-6019-2024

Date of Decision: 15.05.2024

Harmandeep Singh @ Jassar Harmandeep

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Nitish Garg, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. S.S. Chahal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Devansh Gupta, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 75 dated 07.07.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC at Police Station Anaj Mandi, District Patiala and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of settlement agreement dated 03.08.2023 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre, District Court, Patiala.

Pursuant to the order dated 05.02.2024 passed by this Court, the parties have appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Patiala, to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Patiala, has submitted his report along with copies of the statements of the parties vide letter dated 27.03.2024 duly forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Patiala.



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 genuine, voluntary and without any coercion and undue influence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, submits that marriage of the petitioner with respondent No. 2 was solemnized on 02.10.2011 and one male child was born out of the said wedlock on 03.09.2012. It is submitted that the present FIR emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. Now, in order to live peacefully, parties have entered into compromise dated 03.08.2023 (Annexure P-2), according to which, both the parties have agreed not to proceed further with the FIR in question and have decided to amicably part their ways. After entering into the compromise, a joint petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1995, has been also been filed. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is the only accused in the present FIR and he is party to the compromise. The petitioner has never been declared as proclaimed offender.

Learned State counsel has stated that he has 'no objection' in case the FIR is quashed on the basis of compromise qua the petitioner.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the file.

After perusing the report submitted by the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Patiala, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioner and respondent No. 2. 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 here-in-below:-

“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.”

-4-



15.05.2024
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Yes/No

Yes/No