

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**297****CRM-M-29953-2023 (O&M)****Date of order: 27.02.2024****Naren Sridhar****.....Petitioner(s)****Vs.****State of Haryana & Another****.....Respondent(s)****CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA****Present:-**

Mr. Kunal Dawar, Advocate and
Mr. Shashikant Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Aditya Pal Singla, AAG Haryana.

Mr. Abhishek Jindal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Nidhi Gupta, J.

The prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.30 dated 17.04.2023 (Annexure **P-1**) under Sections 323, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Women, Gurugram; and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom including Challan (Annexure P2), on the basis of compromise dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P-3) arrived at between the parties.

Vide orders dated 07.06.2023 and 18.08.2023, Co-ordinate Bench of this Court had directed the parties to appear before Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in terms of certain parameters given in the aforesaid orders dated 07.06.2023 and 18.08.2023, with regard to the compromise dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P-3).

In terms of the orders dated 07.06.2023 and 18.08.2023, passed by Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, parties have appeared before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Gurugram and as per her report dated 10.10.2023 submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements in Court.

A perusal of the above said report would show that petitioner and respondent No.2/complainant appeared and suffered statements with respect to the compromise, which have been found to be voluntary, genuine, and out of free will.

Learned counsel for the petitioners inter alia submits that present FIR emanates from a matrimonial dispute between the parties, which was registered by respondent No.2/complainant/wife against her husband/present petitioner, father-in-law and mother-in-law. However, challan was filed only against the present petitioner, who has not been declared as proclaimed person in the present case. Now, the matter has been compromised by the parties vide settlement dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P3)

Learned State Counsel and learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant do not dispute the above said submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the file.

After perusing the report submitted by the Illaqa Magistrate, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioner and the complainant. 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 hereinbelow:-

“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 hereinabove, this petition is **allowed** and FIR No.30 dated 17.04.2023 (Annexure **P-1**) under Sections 323, 406, 498-A and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Women, Gurugram; and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom including Challan (Annexure P2), on the basis of compromise dated 10.05.2023 (Annexure P-3) arrived at between the parties, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

Petition stands disposed of.

Pending application(s) if any also stand(s) disposed of.

27.02.2024

Sunena

(Nidhi Gupta)

Judge

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