



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

225

CRM-M-9343-2024

Date of Decision: 07.05.2024

Sachin Madan

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Nikhil Vats, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Prashant Deswal, Advocate for
Mr. Suraj Mandhan, Advocate for respondent No.2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner who is husband of respondent No. 2-complainant has filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing of FIR No. 17 dated 16.01.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 323, 406, 498-A, 506 and 34 IPC at Police Station City Arya Nagar, District Rohtak and all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom including the challan report/final report under Section 173(2) Cr.P.C. as well as charge-sheet, on the basis of compromise dated 07.02.2024 (Annexure P-2) effected between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 26.02.2024 passed by this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rohtak, to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate 1st



Class, Rohtak, has submitted his report along with statements of the parties vide letter dated 27.03.2024 duly forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Rohtak.

A perusal of the above said report would show that initially three persons, namely, Reema Madan, Ramesh Madan and Sachin Madan were named in the FIR. However, challan under Section 173 Cr.P.C. has been presented against the present petitioner only. The petitioner 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 petitioner submits that the present FIR emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. He further submits that as per report, the present petitioner is the only party to the compromise and has never been declared as proclaimed offender. There is no other criminal case pending against the petitioner. It is further submitted that the parties have been granted divorce on 13.03.2024.

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 1st Class, Rohtak, 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.”

In view of what has been discussed here-in-above, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 17 dated 16.01.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 323, 406, 498-A, 506 and 34 IPC at Police



Station City Arya Nagar, District Rohtak and all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom including the challan report/final report under Section 173(2) Cr.P.C. as well as charge-sheet, on the basis of compromise dated 07.02.2024 (Annexure P-2), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

07.05.2024

Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No