

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

215

CRM-M-9422-2024
Date of Decision: 01.05.2024

Lavish Sharma

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Aakansha Gupta, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Arjun Atri, Advocate for respondent No.2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner, who is the husband of the complainant/respondent No. 2 herein has filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing of FIR No. 16 dated 30.03.2021 registered under Sections 406, 498-A IPC at Police Station Women, Patiala, District Patiala (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of Compromise/Settlement Agreement dated 31.05.2023 (Annexure P-2) effected between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 22.02.2024 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Patiala, to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Patiala, has submitted her report along with statements of the parties vide letter dated 30.03.2024 duly forwarded by the learned District & 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 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 petitioner is the only party to the compromise and has never been declared as proclaimed offender.

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 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. He further submits that the parties have filed a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act.

Learned State counsel has stated that initially FIR was registered against the husband/petitioner herein, Sushma Sharma (mother-in-law), Neeru Sharma (married sister-in-law) and Pooja Sharma (divorcee sister-in-law). However, challan has been presented against the husband/petitioner only.

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, 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.”

In view of what has been discussed here-in-above, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 16 dated 30.03.2021 registered under Sections 406, 498-A IPC at Police Station Women, Patiala, District Patiala (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of Compromise/Settlement Agreement dated 31.05.2023

(Annexure P-2), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

01.05.2024
Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

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