

CRM-M-14903-2024(O&M)

1

2024:PHHC:064547

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

298

CRM-M-14903-2024(O&M)
Date of Decision: 08.05.2024

AMANDEEP MAHI AND ORS

...Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ORS

...Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Gagandeep Singh Virk, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Satjot Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kanwar Mehtab Singh Jakhar, Advocate
for respondents 2, 3, & 4.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of FIR No.26 dated 08.02.2023 under Sections 452, 354, 323, 506 of IPC registered at Police Station Tibba District Ludhiana and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise in the form of affidavit dated 09.01.2024 (Annexure P-2).

2. The aforementioned FIR had been lodged by respondent No.2/complainant and investigation was commenced thereon.

3. It is submitted by counsel for the petitioners that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and they have resolved their *inter se* dispute, which was reduced into writing as compromise in the form of affidavit dated 09.01.2024 annexed with the present petition as Annexure P-2.

4. On the basis of said compromise, the petitioners have prayed for quashing of the aforesaid FIR and all the subsequent proceedings on the ground that continuation of such proceedings would be a futile exercise.

5. This Court vide order dated 22.03.2024 had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements with regard to the genuineness of the compromise stated to have been arrived at between them. The Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court was also directed to send his/her report along with the said statements.

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana has sent report vide endorsement No.691 dated 19.04.2024 to this Court along with original statement of respondents No. 2 & 3 and joint statement of the petitioners recorded on 09.04.2024 and statement of Investigating Officer ASI-Ravinder Kumar as recorded on 12.04.2024.

7. Report has been received from the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana as per which the statement of the parties to the present petition had been recorded on the date fixed. The statements in original have also been annexed with the report. However, this report reveals that the petitioners no. 2 to 4 have been found innocent during investigation and had not been challaned in this case and despite this fact they have filed this petition.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that names of the petitioners no. 2 to 4 may be deleted from the arraign of the parties as it was due to inadvertence that their names arraigned as such. It is ordered to be so. The names are ordered to be deleted from the arraign of the parties.

8. On the basis of these statements, it is submitted by learned Magistrate that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, out of free Will and without any pressure or coercion. It is also mentioned in the report that apart from the petitioners, there is no other accused in the FIR and that the accused have not been declared proclaimed persons in this case.

9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and besides perusing the report by learned Judicial Magistrate, have also perused the record.

10. It is well settled that the High Court has power to allow compounding of a non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. where it feels that the same is required to prevent the abuse of process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Such power is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone. In this regard, reference can be made to a Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***. It is equally settled position of law that the power of High Court in quashing criminal proceedings or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation. Such power can certainly be exercised in cases relating to offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. The High Court is required to consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate to put an end to the criminal case and if the answer to such question is in affirmative, then the High Court is well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings. Reference in this context can be made to Hon'ble Apex Court judgments cited as ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543*** and ***Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466***.

11. In view of the proposition as settled in the aforementioned cases, this Court finds that continuation of proceedings would be an abuse process of the Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case which squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents and that allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioners by quashing of the FIR would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of legislature enacted

under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.26 dated 08.02.2023 under Sections 452, 354, 323, 506 of IPC registered at Police Station Tibba District Ludhiana and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner no.1 on the basis of compromise in the form of affidavit dated 09.01.2024 (Annexure P-2).

12. Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and statements as recorded before learned Judicial Magistrate.

08.05.2024
Deepak Patwal

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned
- : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable
- : Yes/No