

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

251

CRM-M-62232-2023

Date of Decision: 02.04.2024

Baldev Singh and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Mr. Ashish Bakshi, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

Mr. Ravi Malhotra, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners who are husband (petitioner No. 1) and parents-in-law (petitioners No. 2 and 3) of complainant-respondent No. 2 herein, have filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing of FIR No. 114 dated 20.07.2022 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 498-A IPC at Police Station-Women, district Ludhiana and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of settlement/agreement dated 10.04.2023 and compromise deed dated 05.12.2023 (Annexures P-2 and P-3, respectively) effected between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 11.12.2023 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the parties 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 28.03.2024 duly forwarded by 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 genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present FIR emanates from the matrimonial dispute between the parties. It is submitted that the matter has amicably been settled between the parties before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court vide settlement/agreement dated 10.04.2023 (Annexure P-2), as per which, the parties have reconciled and started living together as husband and wife. Further, it is submitted that the present FIR was lodged only against the present petitioners and they have never been declared as proclaimed offender(s).

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

In view of what has been discussed here-in-above, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 114 dated 20.07.2022 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 498-A IPC at Police Station-Women, district Ludhiana and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of settlement/agreement dated 10.04.2023 and compromise deed dated 05.12.2023 (Annexures P-2 and P-3, respectively), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

02.04.2024

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

rishu

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No