



**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

272

CRM-M-48108-2023
Date of decision: 15.05.2024

URMILA AND OTHERSPetitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Divyanth Vats, Advocate,
Mr. H.S. Bath, Advocate for
Mr. Ritesh Pandey, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Raghav Garg, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Aazam Khan, Advocate for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI. J.(Oral)

1. The instant petition filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., proffers the hereinafter extracted relief, as craved by the petitioners, inasmuch as, quashing of criminal complaint No.COMI 138 of 2016 dated 26.05.2016, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, titled as "Manpreet Singh versus Urmila and Others" pending in the Court of learned JMIC, Batala, (Annexure P-1) along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise dated 10.08.2023 (Annexure P-2), as entered into *inter se* the petitioners and the respondent No.2.

2. Upon an affirmative response from the learned counsel for the respondent No.2 *qua* the compromise (Annexure P-2), a this Court through an order



- 2 -

drawn on 19.03.2024, upon the instant petition, directed the parties to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned, for getting their respective statements recorded *qua* authenticity of the compromise (Annexure P-2). Moreover, the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned was also directed to send a report in the above regard.

3. Consequent to the making of the directions (*supra*), the parties appeared before the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division)-cum-Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Batala, and got their respective statements recorded, thereby authenticating the compromise (Annexure P-2). Accordingly, in compliance of the directions (*supra*) of this Court, a Report bearing No.326 dated 16.04.2024, has been received from the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division)-cum-Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Batala,, wherein, a satisfaction has been recorded by the Additional Civil Judge (Senior Division)-cum-Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Batala, *qua* the compromise (*supra*) being drawn in a genuine and voluntary manner, without any coercion or undue influence.

4. This Court has heard counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.

5. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, in **CRM-M-25669-2020 (O&M)**, titled **“Abhishek Singh & others V/s State of Punjab & others”**, Pronounced on: **07.04.2022**, while granting a similar relief, as craved in the instant petition, has observed as under:-

“9. The following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition:-

a) The accused and the private respondents have amicably settled the matter between them in terms of the compromise deed and the statements recorded before the concerned Court;

b) A perusal of the documents reveal that the settlement has not been



- 3 -

secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means;

c) The victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings;

d) There is no objection from the private respondents in case present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed;

e) In the given facts, the occurrence does not affect public peace or tranquillity, moral turpitude or harm the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy;

f) The rejection of compromise may also lead to ill will. The pendency of trial affects career and happiness;

g) There is nothing on the record to prima facie consider the accused as an unscrupulous, incorrigible, or professional offender;

h) The purpose of criminal jurisprudence is reformatory in nature and to work to bring peace to family, community, and society;

i) The exercise of the inherent power for quashing the conviction, sentence and all previous proceedings is justified to secure the ends of justice.”

6. In the light of the hereinabove recorded aspects and considering the fact that the offences, for which the petitioners/accused have been charged, are not grave in nature, as also in view of the law laid down in ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543*** and ***Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, the present petition for quashing the FIR (supra) is hereby **allowed**.

7. Resultantly, criminal complaint No.COMI 138 of 2016 dated 26.05.2016, under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, titled as "Manpreet Singh versus Urmila and Others" pending in the Court of learned JMJC, Batala, (Annexure P-1) along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby **quashed**, on the basis of the compromise dated 10.08.2023



(Annexure P-2), subject to the payment of costs of Rs.5,000/-, to be forthwith deposited with the District Legal Services Authority concerned.

15.05.2024
amandeep

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

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