



CRM-M-45207-2023 **-1-**

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

220

CRM-M-45207-2023

Date of Decision: 27.05.2024

Rishi Nagpal and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Shivam Grover, Advocate for
Ms. Shairon Tyagi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. S.S. Chahal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Abhimanyu Kalsy, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 84 dated 21.07.2015 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406, 498-A, 420 and 120-B IPC (Sections 465, 463 and 471 IPC were added later on) at Police Station Women, Ludhiana, Punjab and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise deed dated 07.08.2023 (Annexure P-3) arrived at between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 07.02.2024 passed by this Court, the parties have appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, has submitted her report along with statements of the parties vide letter dated 22.04.2024 duly forwarded by



CRM-M-45207-2023 -2-

the learned District and Sessions Judge, Ludhiana.

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 valid, genuine, voluntary and without any coercion and undue influence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, submits that the present FIR emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. It is submitted that petitioner No.1 is the husband; whereas petitioners No. 2 and 3 are parents-in-law of complainant/respondent No. 2. Marriage of petitioner No. 1 with complainant/respondent No. 2 was solemnized on 18.11.2012. No child was born out of the said wedlock. 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 deed dated 07.08.2023 (Annexure P-3), according to which, both the parties have agreed not to proceed further with the FIR in question. It is also submitted that parties have also been granted divorce by way of mutual consent under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, vide judgment and decree dated 01.08.2019, passed by the learned Family Court, Ludhiana. Further, it is submitted that petitioners are the only accused in the present case and they have never been declared as proclaimed offenders.

Learned State counsel has stated that he has 'no objection' in case the FIR is quashed on the basis of compromise qua the



CRM-M-45207-2023 -3-

petitioners.

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, Ludhiana, 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.”

Learned counsel for the petitioners, additionally pointed out that vide order dated 18.03.2016 (Annexure P-2) passed in CRM-M-27626-2015, a co-ordinate Bench of this Court had directed that the anticipatory bail granted to petitioner No. 1 herein be made absolute, subject to the condition that in addition to the conditions as enshrined in Section 438(2) Cr.P.C., that petitioner No. 1 shall deposit an amount Rs.7,00,000/- before the learned trial Court. It is submitted that as per para 4 (at page 31 of the paper-book) of the compromise deed dated 07.08.2023 (Annexure P-3), wherein it has been stated that the respondent No. 2 has ‘no objection’, if the said amount of Rs.7,00,000/- so deposited by petitioner No. 1 on 30.04.2016, is released to him. Thus, it is prayed that the aforesaid amount of Rs.7,00,000/- be released to petitioner No. 1.

Ordered accordingly.

In view of what has been discussed here-in-above, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 84 dated 21.07.2015 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 406, 498-A, 420 and 120-B IPC (Sections 465,



CRM-M-45207-2023 -5-

463 and 471 IPC were added later on) at Police Station Women, Ludhiana, Punjab and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise deed dated 07.08.2023 (Annexure P-3) arrived at between the parties, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

27.05.2024
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

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