

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

286

CRM-M-32666-2023 (O&M)
Date of order: 15.02.2024

Lakhvinder Singh & Others

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Punjab & Another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON’BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

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

Mr. Sukhsandesh Singh Chahal, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Sukhdeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Nidhi Gupta, J.

The prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.18 dated 07.11.2022 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 498-A, 406, 420 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Women, Rural, District Ludhiana, on the basis of compromise deed dated 22.05.2023 (Annexure P2).

Vide order dated 08.11.2023 , a 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 order dated 08.11.2023 with regard to the compromise deed dated 22.05.2023 (Annexure P2).

In terms of the order dated 08.11.2023 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court parties have appeared before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Jagraon and as per her report dated

30.01.2024 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 the petitioners and respondent No.2 have 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 petitioner inter alia submits that present FIR emanates from a matrimonial dispute between the parties. The petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 were married on 13.03.2022. He further submits that 5 persons were named in the FIR i.e. the petitioner No.1/husband, father-in-law/petitioner No.3, mother-in-law/petitioner No.2, brother-in-law and sister-in-law of respondent No.2/wife, however, challan was presented only against the present petitioners i.e. petitioner No.1/husband, mother-in-law/petitioner No.2 and father-in-law/petitioner No.3. It is also submitted that now with the intervention of respectables, compromise deed dated 22.05.2023 (Annexure P2) has been entered into between the parties, wherein both the parties have decided to live separately. It has also been agreed upon between the parties that petitioners shall give a sum of Rs.13,50,000/- to the respondent No.2/wife, out of which Rs.6,75,000/- is to be paid at the time of recording of first motion statements; and remaining Rs.6,75,000/- is to be paid at the time of recording of second motion statements. It is further submitted that the petitioners were not declared proclaimed offenders in the present case.

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

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has again reiterated that the matter has been settled and the said compromise is in the interest of all the persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the two parties.

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 petitioners 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.18 dated 07.11.2022 (Annexure **P-1**) under Sections 498-A, 406, 420 and 120-B IPC registered at Police Station Women, Rural, District Ludhiana, on the basis of compromise deed dated 22.05.2023 (Annexure P2), is ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

Petition stands disposed of.

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

15.02.2024
Sunena

(Nidhi Gupta)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No