

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

260

CRM-M No.32184 of 2019
Date of decision: 02.02.2024

IQBAL SINGH AND ANOTHER

.... Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Ruchika Sabherwal, D.A.G., Punjab.

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

MANISHA BATRA, J. (oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of cross version DDR No. 16 dated 27.11.2016 under Sections 323, 324, 354, 148, 149 and 379 of IPC and Sections 3 & 4 of SC/ST Act (Annexure P-2) recorded in FIR No.97 dated 19.11.2016 registered under Sections 295, 323, 341, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Subhan Pur, District Kapurthala and all the subsequent proceedings arising out of said DDR, on the basis of the same compromise dated 28.05.2019 stated to have been arrived at between the parties in FIR No.97 dated 19.11.2016 as well as in cross version DDR also (Annexure P-3).
2. The aforementioned DDR had been lodged by respondent No.2/complainant and investigation was commenced thereon.
3. It is submitted by counsel for the petitioners that in fact, a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and they have resolved

their *inter se* dispute, which was reduced into writing as compromise dated 28.05.2019 annexed with the present petition as Annexure P-3.

4. On the basis of said compromise, the petitioners have prayed for quashing of the aforesaid DDR and all the subsequent proceedings on the ground that continuation of such proceedings would be a futile exercise.

5. This Court vide order dated 24.08.2023 and thereafter vide order dated 29.11.2023 had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa/Duty Magistrate for recording their statements with regard to the genuineness of the compromise stated to have been arrived at between them. The Illaqa/Duty Magistrate was also directed to send his/her report along with the said statements.

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kapurthala has sent report vide endorsement No.32 dated 11.01.2024 to this Court along with photocopies of the statements of respondent No.2/complaint-Baksho, petitioner No.1 (recorded through video conferencing) and petitioner No.2 as well as statement of retired Investigating Officer SI Dilbag Singh recorded on 11.01.2024.

7. On the basis of these statements, it is submitted by learned Magistrate that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, out of free Will and without any pressure or coercion. It is also mentioned in the report that apart from the petitioners, there are seven other accused in the cross version DDR and that the accused have not been declared proclaimed persons in this case.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and besides perusing the report by learned Judicial Magistrate, have also perused the record.

9. It is well settled that the High Court has power to allow compounding of a non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. where it feels that the same is required to prevent the abuse of process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Such power is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone. In this regard, reference can be made to a Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***. It is equally settled position of law that the power of High Court in quashing criminal proceedings or FIR/DDR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation. Such power can certainly be exercised in cases relating to offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. The High Court is required to consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate to put an end to the criminal case and if the answer to such question is in affirmative, then the High Court is well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings. Reference in this context can be made to Hon'ble Apex Court judgments cited as ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543*** and ***Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466***.

10. In view of the proposition as settled in the aforementioned cases, this Court finds that continuation of proceedings would be an abuse process of the Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case which squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents and that

allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioners by quashing of the DDR would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of legislature enacted under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the DDR No. 16 dated 27.11.2016 under Sections 323, 324, 354, 148, 149 and 379 of IPC and Sections 3 & 4 of SC/ST Act (Annexure P-2) recorded in FIR No.97 dated 19.11.2016 registered under Sections 295, 323, 341, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Subhan Pur, District Kapurthala and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners herein, on the basis of compromise dated 28.05.2019 (Annexure P-3).

11. Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and statements as recorded before learned Judicial Magistrate.

02.02.2024
Jyoti-IV

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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