

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

256

CRM-M-25823-2023

Date of Decision: 18.07.2024

Rajender Pal Sharma and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Sanyam Khetarpal, Advocate for the petitioners.


Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Shivam Chaudhary, Advocate for
Mr. Vinay Pandey, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 218 dated 01.06.2018 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 323/34 IPC (Sections 376 and 498-A IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Shivaji Nagar, District Gurugram and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P-2), entered into between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 29.05.2023 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the parties have appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram, to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram, has submitted his report along with copies of statements of the parties vide letter dated




04.09.2023 duly forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram.

A perusal of the above said report would show that the petitioners and respondent No. 2 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 emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. It is submitted that petitioners No.1 and 2 are the parents-in-law; whereas as petitioner No. 3 is the husband of complainant/respondent No.2 herein. Marriage of the petitioner No. 3 with complainant/respondent No.2 was solemnized on 24.02.2014. Due to temperamental differences, the parties could not cohabit together and started residing separately. Now better sense has prevailed between the parties and in order to live peacefully, parties have entered into compromise dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P-2), according to which, both the parties have agreed not to proceed further with the FIR in question.

Learned State counsel has stated that he has 'no objection' in case the FIR is quashed on the basis of compromise qua the petitioners. On instructions from HC Sonu, learned counsel for the State has informed that none of the petitioners have been declared as proclaimed offender, in the present case. It is also submitted that cancellation report in the matter was prepared on 01.01.2019 and the same has also been presented before the learned Illaqa Magistrate, which is still pending adjudication before Court concerned.



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 Ist 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. 218 dated 01.06.2018 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 323/34 IPC (Sections 376 and 498-A IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Shivaji Nagar, District Gurugram and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P-2), entered into between the parties, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

18.07.2024
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

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