

CRM-M-56485-2023

263 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-56485-2023

Date of Decision: 10.01.2024

DARSHAN LAL AND OTHERS

...Petitioners

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARPREET SINGH BRAR

Present: Mr. Tarun Singla, Advocate for
Ms. Prathula Sethi, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Aditya Kapoor, AAG Punjab.

Ms. Swati Verma, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

HARPREET SINGH BRAR J. (Oral)

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure seeking quashing of DDR No. 18 dated 09.09.2023 registered under Sections 323, 324 and 34 of Indian Penal Code (Section 326 of IPC added later on) in FIR No. 48 dated 09.09.2023 registered under Sections 323, 324 and 34 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station GRP Pathankot, Police District Govt. Railway Police District Pathankot all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise dated 20.09.2023 (Annexure P-3).

2. The DDR has been registered on the statement of complainant- Mandeep Singh- respondent No. 2, who was admitted in the Civil Hospital, Batala, on the allegations of being beaten by the petitioners. Now with the intervention of respectable persons, the matter has been amicably compromised between the parties and they have resolved their disputes and

no differences.

3. Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before the trial court/Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. In pursuance of the direction, a report has been received from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Batala stating that the compromise arrived at between the parties is without any pressure or coercion from any one and the same is genuine one.

4. Learned Assistant Advocate General, Punjab on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for respondent No. 2 admitted the factum of compromise and submitted that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the DDR, in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have gone through the record with their able assistance.

6. The parties have arrived at a compromise and settled their dispute. A compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society. After considering the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, continuance of criminal prosecution would be an exercise in futility, as the chances of ultimate conviction are bleak. A two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Shakunta Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63***, speaking through Justice V.R. Krishna Iyer, has held as under:-

“4.The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.....”

7. Consequently, keeping in view the fact that the dispute has been amicably settled and in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466** and **Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834** and Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (Crl.) 1052**, this petition is allowed and DDR No. 18 dated 09.09.2023 registered under Sections 323, 324 and 34 of Indian Penal Code (Section 326 of IPC added later on) in FIR No. 48 dated 09.09.2023 registered under Sections 323, 324 and 34 of Indian Penal Code at Police Station GRP Pathankot, Police District Govt. Railway Police District Pathankot and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed qua the petitioners only.

10.01.2024
Ajay Goswami

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)
JUDGE

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