



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

226

CRM-M-6659-2024

Date of Decision:22.05.2024

Rohit Saigal and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, A.A.G., Haryana.

Ms. Gaganpreet Kaur, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners, who are the husband and parents-in-law of the complainant/respondent No.2 herein have filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing of FIR No. 486 dated 26.04.2016 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 34, 406, 498-A and 506 of IPC, at Police Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise deed dated 25.07.2023 (Annexure P-2).

Pursuant to the order dated 09.02.2024 passed by this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak, to get their statements recorded. Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak, has submitted his report along with statements of the parties vide letter dated 29.02.2024 duly forwarded by the learned District & Sessions Judge, Rohtak on 04.03.2024.

A perusal of the above said report would show that initially



seven persons namely Rohit Sehgal, Narender Sehgal, Asha Sehgal, Rahul Sehgal, Geetika Sehgal, Reetu Verma and Sushil Verma were arrayed as accused in the FIR but charge-sheet has been filed only against three accused persons namely Rohit Sehgal, Narender Sehgal and Asha Sehgal. The petitioners and respondent No. 2 have appeared and suffered statements with respect to the compromise, which have been found to be valid, genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present FIR emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. He further submits that as per report, the petitioners and respondent No. 2 are the only party to the compromise and have never been declared as proclaimed offenders. They are not involved in any other case. He further submits that the parties have been granted divorce under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act vide judgment and decree dated 30.01.2024.

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

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

After perusing the report submitted by the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners 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.”

In view of what has been discussed here-in-above, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 486 dated 26.04.2016 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 34, 406, 498-A and 506 of IPC, at Police

Station Kalanaur, District Rohtak and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise deed dated 25.07.2023 (Annexure P-2), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

22.05.2024

Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)

JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No