

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-7225-2023
DECIDED ON: 20.01.2024

KRISHAN GOPAL SHARMA @ KRISHAN GOPAL BHARDWAJ
.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Abhinav Aggarwal, Advocate
for the petitioner through VC.

Mr. Pawan Jhanda, DAG Haryana.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

A request has been received from the counsel for the petitioner to appear in the present case through Video Conferencing.

Prayer is acceded to.

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.0310, dated 23.06.2022, under Sections 313, 376(2) (n) and 506 of IPC, 1860 and Section 3 of SC & ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 (Amendment 2015), registered at Police Station Saran District Faridabad (Annexure P-1) and later on local police delete Section 313 of IPC and arbitrarily added Sections 33 & 89 of SC & ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act 1989 (Amendment 2015), with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 09.08.2022 (Annexure P-2).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that as per complainant's affidavit, she was live-in relationship with the petitioner for the last six years prior to lodging of the FIR in question and their relations were consensual.

matter and filed the present petition for quashing of FIR.

Vide order dated 05.05.2023, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and report with regard to the genuineness of the compromise was called for.

The report dated 10.07.2023 has been received from Additional District & Sessions Judge, Faridabad, stating that the parties have entered into a compromise, which is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, has held:-

“The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in noncompoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined parameters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever- lasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between

two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.”

The legal principles as laid down for quashing of the judgment were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '**Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another,(2012) 10 SCC 303'**. Furthermore, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '**Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another” (2017) 9 SCC 641'**.

It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings.

In the present case, the respondent is a 39 years old lady and she does not carry any grouse against the petitioner, thus the denial of prayer of the petitioner not only would be against the interest of justice, but also victim. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be a waste of judicial time and there appears to be no chances of conviction.

In view of above, FIR No.0310, dated 23.06.2022, (Annexure P-1), with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is quashed qua the petitioner, on the basis of compromise dated 09.08.2022 (Annexure P-2).

The present petition is hereby allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

20.01.2024

Sham

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