



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

261

CRM-M-15858-2024

Date of Decision: 16.07.2024

Naveen

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Arun Luthra, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Mr. A.P.S.Tung, 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. 0327 dated 18.06.2018 (Annexure P-2) under Sections 323, 354, 377, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC (later on Sections 377 and 354 IPC deleted), registered at Police Station Gohana City and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 01.03.2024 (Annexure P-7) arrived at between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 02.04.2024 passed by this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate Gohana, to get their statements recorded. Learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate Gohana, has submitted her report along with statements of the parties vide letter dated 29.04.2024 duly



forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Sonipat on 01.05.2024.

A perusal of the above said report would show that the petitioner and respondent No. 2 have appeared and suffered their 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. It is further stated that a joint petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 for divorce by way of mutual consent was filed before the Family Court, Sonapat which was allowed vide order dated 30.01.2024 (Annexure P-6) (inadvertently a typographical error was made in the order dated 02.04.2024 wherein the date of order is mentioned as 30.1.2014). He submits that as per report, the present petitioner and respondent No.2 are the only party to the compromise and the petitioner has never been declared as proclaimed offender. The petitioner is not involved in any other case.

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 Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate Gohana, 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. 0327 dated 18.06.2018 (Annexure P-2) under Sections 323, 354, 377, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC (later on Sections



377 and 354 IPC deleted), registered at Police Station Gohana City and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 01.03.2024 (Annexure P-7), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

16.07.2024

Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No