

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

290

CRM-M No.56172 of 2023
Date of decision: 01.02.2024

JATINDERPAL SINGH AND ANOTHER Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. M.S. Nagra, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Parminder Singh Kanwar, 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 complaint bearing No. COMI/26/2020 dated 20.07.2020 under Sections 406, 498-A, 354, 354-A, 354-C and 34 of IPC as filed by respondent No.2 which is pending before learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran. The petitioners have been summoned as accused in the aforementioned complaint and were ordered to face trial for commission of offence punishable under Sections 498-A of IPC vide order dated 17.09.2021.
2. The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of the complaint and the summoning order dated 17.09.2021 on the basis of a compromise dated 25.10.2023 (Annexure P-3) as arrived at between the parties.

3. It is submitted by counsel for the petitioners that 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 25.10.2023 annexed with the present petition as Annexure P-3.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the parties by making amicable settlement have resolved their *inter se* dispute and therefore, it is submitted by them that the quashing of the aforementioned complaint and the proceedings emanating therefrom, deserve to be allowed as the continuation of thereof would be a futile exercise.

5. This Court vide order dated 07.11.2023 had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements with regard to the genuineness of the compromise stated to have been arrived at between them. The Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court was also directed to send his/her report along with the said statements.

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran has sent report dated 22.12.2023 to this Court along with the statements of respondent No.2/complainant-Kiranjit Kaur, petitioners/accused recorded on 14.12.2023.

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 is no other accused in the complaint 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. 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 or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation. Such power can certainly be exercised in cases 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 complaint bearing No. COMI/26/2020 dated 20.07.2020 and summoning

orders dated 17.09.2021 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 complaint No. COMI/26/2020 dated 20.07.2020 as pending before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Tarn Taran, summoning order dated 17.09.2021 and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise.

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.

01.02.2024
Jyoti-IV

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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