



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

273

CRM-M-23881-2024

Date of Decision: 10.07.2024

Rajwinder Singh and another

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Vikasdeep Singh, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Roja Agnihotri, Advocate for respondents No. 2 and 3.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 124 dated 25.06.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 354-C and 506 IPC at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 01.05.2024 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 13.05.2024 passed by this Court, the parties have appeared before the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi, to get their statements recorded. Learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi, has submitted her report along with copies of statements of the parties vide letter dated 08.07.2024 duly forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge,



Kapurthala.

A perusal of the above said report would show that the petitioners and respondents No. 2 and 3 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 petitioners, *inter alia*, submits that the present FIR was registered by the complainant/respondent No.2 herein on 25.06.2023. The allegations levelled in the FIR are that the petitioner No. 1 was making a video with his mobile from the open space by climbing on the pipes when respondent No. 3 (daughter of respondent No.2) was taking bath. When confronted with the family members of the petitioner No.1; his father who is petitioner No. 2 herein, started abusing to respondent No. 2. Now better sense has prevailed between the parties and in order to live peacefully, parties have entered into compromise dated 01.05.2024 (Annexure P-2), according to which, both the parties have agreed not to proceed further with the FIR in question. It is submitted that only the present petitioners was named in the FIR. It is further submitted that 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 Sub



Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners and respondents No. 2 and 3. 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. 124 dated 25.06.2023 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 354-C and 506 IPC at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 01.05.2024 (Annexure P-2), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

10.07.2024
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

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