

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-7367-2024 in
CRM-M-54888-2022
DECIDED ON: 20.02.2024

HARDEEP SINGH
.....PETITIONER

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Alok Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG Punjab.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

CRM-7367-2024

Prayer in this application is for preponing the date of hearing in the
main petition from 18.04.2024 to an early date.

Learned State counsel has endorsed no objection to the present petition.

For the reasons mentioned in the application as well as no objection
endorsed by learned State counsel, the application is allowed.

Main case is preponed to today itself from 18.04.2024.

Main case taken on board.

CRM-M-54888-2022

1. This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.86,
dated 22.03.2019 under Sections 384, 511, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and
Section 67-A of IT Act, 2000, registered at Police Station Division No.8, District

Ludhiana (Annexure P-1), with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 07.05.2022 (Annexure P-2).

2. During the pendency of the dispute, the parties have compromised the matter and filed the present petition for quashing of FIR.

3. Vide order dated 07.10.2023, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and report with regard to the genuineness of the compromise was called for.

4. The report dated 02.11.2023 has been received from Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana stating that the parties have entered into a compromise, which is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

5. Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, has held:-

“The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in noncompoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined parameters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an

extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever- lasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.”

6. The legal principles as laid down for quashing of the judgment were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '**Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another,(2012) 10 SCC 303'**. Furthermore, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of '**Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another” (2017) 9 SCC 641'**.

7. It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be a waste of judicial time and there appears to be no chances of conviction.

8. In view of above, FIR(Annexure P-1), with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is quashed qua the petitioner, on the basis of compromise dated 07.05.2022 (Annexure P-2).

9. The present petition is hereby allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

20.02.2024

Meenu

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