

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

289

CRM-M-64637-2023 (O&M)
Date of order: 15.02.2024

Rahul Kheterpal

.....Petitioner(s)

Vs.

State of Punjab & Another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present:- Mr. Sunil Sihag, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhsandesh Singh Chahal, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Lokesh Vohra, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Nidhi Gupta, J.

The prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.18 dated 21.03.2017 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC registered at Police Station Women Cell, Patiala; and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise/settlement agreement dated 05.07.2023 (Annexure P2).

Vide order dated 12.01.2024 , a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate for getting their statements recorded in terms of certain parameters given in the aforesaid order dated 12.01.2024 with regard to the compromise/settlement agreement dated 05.07.2023 (Annexure P2).

In terms of the order dated 12.01.2024 passed by a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court parties have appeared before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Patiala and as per his report dated

07.02.2024 submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements in Court.

A perusal of the above said report would show that the petitioner and respondent No.2 have appeared and suffered statements with respect to the compromise, which have been found to be voluntary, genuine, and out of free will.

Learned counsel for the petitioner inter alia submits that present FIR emanates from a matrimonial dispute between the parties. He further submits that 5 persons were named in the FIR, however, challan was presented only against the present petitioner/husband of respondent No.2 herein. It is further submitted that the petitioner was not declared proclaimed offender in the present case. It is also submitted that as per the compromise/settlement agreement dated 05.07.2023 (Annexure P2), matter has been settled for a sum of Rs.18 lakh to be paid by petitioner/husband towards permanent alimony and past, present and future maintenance; and parties would withdraw all the cases filed and pending against each other. Out of the said Rs.18 lakh, Rs.12 lakh has already been paid and remaining Rs.6 lakh is to be paid to the respondent No.2, at the time of recording of second motion statements.

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

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has again reiterated that the matter has been settled and the said compromise is in

the interest of all the persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the two parties.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the file.

After perusing the report submitted by the Illaqa Magistrate, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioner and the complainant. 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 hereinbelow:-

“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 hereinabove, this petition is **allowed**; and FIR No.18 dated 21.03.2017 (Annexure **P-1**) under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC registered at Police Station Women Cell, Patiala; and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise/settlement agreement dated 05.07.2023 (Annexure P2), are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

Petition stands disposed of.

Pending application(s) if any also stand(s) disposed of.

15.02.2024
Sunena

(Nidhi Gupta)
Judge

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