



226

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-24604-2024 (O&M)
DECIDED ON: 31.05.2024**

ZAKIR HUSSAIN AND OTHERS

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL.

Present: Mr. Rajesh Lamba, Advocate for
the petitioners.

Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, AAG, Haryana
Mr. Vinod Kumar, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 4.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

1. The jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been invoked seeking quashing of FIR 835, dated 26.10.2017 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 323, 148, 149, 452, 506 of IPC registered at Police Station Mujesar, District Faridabad with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 29.04.2024 (Annexures P-2).
2. During the pendency of the dispute, the parties have compromised the matter and filed the present petition for quashing of FIR.
3. Vide order dated 16.05.2024, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court for recording of their statements with regard to genuineness of compromise and report in that regard was called for.
4. The report dated 24.05.2024 has been received from learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Faridabad stating that the parties have entered into a



compromise voluntarily and without any pressure, coercion or undue influence and the same appears to be genuine. None of the accused-persons has been declared as proclaimed offender.

5. Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, has held:-

“The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in noncompoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined parameters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever- lasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.”



6. The legal principles as laid down for quashing of the judgment were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of 'Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another,(2012) 10 SCC 303'. Furthermore, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of 'Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another" (2017) 9 SCC 641'.

7. It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be a wastage of judicial time and there appears to be no chances of conviction.

8. In view of above, FIR 835, dated 26.10.2017 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 323, 148, 149, 452, 506 of IPC registered at Police Station Mujesar, District Faridabad with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise dated 29.04.2024 (Annexures P-2).

9. In the afore-said terms, the present petition is, hereby allowed.

31.05.2024
raman/sham

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
Whether reportable: Yes/No