



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

270

CRM-M-12602-2024

Date of Decision: 17.07.2024

Parveen

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Himanshu Joshi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Hukam Singh, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 0171 dated 13.11.2020 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections registered under Sections 377, 498-A and 506 IPC (Section 406 IPC added later on) at Police Station Sohna, District Gurugram and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 01.03.2024 (Annexure P-2), arrived at between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 12.03.2024 passed by this Court, the parties have appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sohna to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sohna, has submitted his report along with statements of the parties vide letter dated 02.04.2024 duly forwarded by the learned



District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram.

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 the present FIR emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. Marriage of the petitioner with complainant/ respondent No.2 was solemnized on 29.11.2023. Learned counsel submits that due to inadvertent error, it has been stated in para 2 of the petition that no child was born out of the wedlock of the petitioner and respondent No.2. In fact, two children were born out of the said wedlock, who are currently in the care and custody of respondent No.2. Due to temperamental differences, the parties could not cohabit together and started residing separately. Now better sense has prevailed between the parties and in order to live peacefully, parties have entered into compromise dated 01.3.2024 (Annexure P-2), according to which, both the parties have agreed not to proceed further with the FIR in question. It is also submitted that a joint petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, for divorce by way of mutual consent has also been filed before the Family Court, concerned, wherein first motion statements of the parties have already been recorded and the second motion statement is to be recorded. It is submitted that the matter has been settled in all Rs.13,00,000/- as permanent alimony, out of which Rs.6,50,000/- have




already been paid to the respondent No.2 on the date of recording of first motion statement and rest Rs.6,50,000/- will be paid on the date of recording of second motion statement. Further, it is submitted that initially, four persons were named in the FIR, however, three out of them have been declared innocent during investigation and the challan has been filed against the present petitioner. It is further submitted that 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, Sohna, 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. 0171 dated 13.11.2020 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections registered under Sections 377, 498-A and 506 IPC (Section 406 IPC added later on) at Police Station Sohna, District Gurugram and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 01.03.2024 (Annexure P-2), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

17.07.2024
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned Yes/No

Whether Reportable Yes/No