

CRM-M-24825-2024 -1-

2024:PHHC:094582



IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

272

CRM-M-24825-2024

Date of Decision: 25.07.2024

Vicky Kumar and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Ms. Gurpreet Kaur Sarabha, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Rishu Madan, A.A.G., Punjab.

Ms. Sukhman Kaur, Advocate for respondent No.2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners who are the husband; parents-in-law and sister-in-law (nanad) of the complainant/respondent No.2 herein, have filed the present petition for quashing of FIR No. 186 dated 05.10.2023 registered under Section 498-A, 406 IPC, at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 15.02.2024 (Annexure P-3) arrived at between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 17.05.2024 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Budhlada, to get their statements recorded. Learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Budhlada, has submitted her report along with statements of the parties vide letter dated



17.07.2024 duly forwarded by learned District and Sessions Judge, Mansa on 18.07.2024.

A perusal of the above said report would show that there were 4 accused named in the present FIR. However, accused Ramesh Kumar (petitioner No.2 herein has died). The remaining 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.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present FIR emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. He further submits that as per report, the present petitioners and respondent No.2 are the only party to the compromise. The petitioners have never been declared as proclaimed offenders and are not involved in any other case.

Learned State counsel, as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 have stated that they have '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, Budhlada, 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**; FIR No. 186 dated 05.10.2023 registered under Section 498-A, 406 IPC, at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the



basis of compromise dated 15.02.2024 (Annexure P-3), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

25.07.2024
Divyanshi

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether Reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No