



324

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-15700-2025
DATE OF DECISION: 24.04.2025**

MAHINGA SINGH AND OTHERS ...PETITIONERS

Versus

**STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER
... RESPONDENTS**

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Bahul Bunger, Advocate for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Rajiv Verma, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Parvez Chaudhary, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

SANDEEP MOUDGIL, J (ORAL)

This is a petition under Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, for quashing FIR No.59 dated 26.08.2018 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 323, 324, 325, 506, 34 and 201 IPC, registered at Police station, Lohian, District Jalandhar alongwith all consequential proceedings including the judgment of conviction and sentence dated 20.03.2024 (Annexure P-3), arising out of the said FIR on the basis of Compromise dated 15.02.2025 (Annexure P-6) arrived at between the parties.

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

Vide order dated 21.03.2025, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and report with regard to the genuineness of the compromise was called for.

The report dated 29.03.2025 has been received from Judicial Magistrate First Class, Nakodar, stating that the parties have entered into a compromise, which is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 submits that he has no objection if the petition is allowed.

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 para-meters 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.”

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'.

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.

Learned counsel, for the petitioners submits that since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties, therefore, the parties may be permitted to compound the offence; and by setting aside the judgments/orders passed by the Courts below, the petitioner be ordered to be acquitted of the charges.

Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent No.2 does not dispute the compromise arrived at between the parties. He has expressed his no objection for compounding of the offence as prayed by the counsel for the petitioner.

In view of the above, finding the prayer of the petitioner to be genuine and in view of the fact that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties, this Court finds that it would not be unjustified if the offence, for which the petitioner has been convicted, is permitted to be compounded.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed.

Necessary permission for compounding of offence for which the petitioner was convicted and sentenced by the trial Court, is granted. As a result of compounding, the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 20.03.2024 (Annexure P-3) and FIR No.59 dated 26.08.2018 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 323, 324, 325, 506, 34 and 201 IPC, registered at Police station, Lohian, District Jalandhar alongwith all consequential proceedings arising out of the said FIR on the basis of Compromise dated 15.02.2025 (Annexure P-6), is quashed qua the petitioners.

The present petition is hereby allowed.

(SANDEEP MOUDGIL)
JUDGE

24.04.2025
anuradha

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