



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

264

CRM-M-22179-2024

Date of Decision: 16.07.2024

Abhishek Kumar Jha and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Mukesh Yadav, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

Mr. Deepak Goyal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners who are the husband and parents-in-law of the complainant/respondent No.2 herein, has filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing of FIR No. 22 dated 27.02.2021 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 406/506/498-A/34 IPC, registered at Women Police Station, Sector-51, Gurugram, District Gurugram and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 18.04.2024 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 06.05.2024 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gurugram, to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gurugram, has submitted his report along with statements of the parties vide letter dated 17.05.2024 duly



forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram on 18.05.2024.

A perusal of the above said report would show that initially seven accused were arraigned in the FIR namely 1) Abhishek Jha (husband), 2) Rajeev Narayan Jha (father-in-law), 3) Aparna Jha (mother-in-law) (wrongly written as sister-in-law), 4) Abhijeet Jha (brother-in-law), 5) Meera Devi (Bua), 6) Sanjeev Jha (Chacha) and 7) Neha Jha (sister-in-law). However, challan is filed only against the present petitioners. The petitioners 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. However, one FIR bearing No. 409/2022 registered under Sections 498A, 341, 323, 504, 506, 34 IPC and 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act is pending against the petitioners.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present FIR emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. He submits that as per report, the present petitioners and respondent No.2 are the only party to the compromise and the petitioners have never been declared as proclaimed offenders.

Learned State counsel has stated that he has 'no objection' in case the FIR is quashed on the basis of compromise qua the petitioners.

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, Gurugram, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners 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. 22 dated 27.02.2021 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 406/506/498-A/34 IPC, registered at Women Police Station, Sector-51, Gurugram, District Gurugram and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 18.04.2024 (Annexure P-2), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

16.07.2024

Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No