



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

259

CRM-M-22264-2025

Date of Decision: 28.05.2025

Paramjeet Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Mr. Paramjit Singh Jammu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, A.A.G, Haryana.

Mr. Santosh Kumar Yadav, Advocate for
Ms. Baljit Kaur, Advocate, for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No.168 dated 20.12.2017 registered under Sections 279, 337, 427, 338 of IPC, at Police Station Odhan, District Sirsa and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom as well as judgment of conviction dated 10.04.2023 and order of sentence dated 11.04.2023, on the basis of compromise dated 07.04.2025 (Annexure P-3).

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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 FIR and the proceedings emanating therefrom, deserve to be allowed as the continuation thereof would be a futile exercise.

3. This Court vide order dated 28.04.2025 had directed the parties to appear before the trial Court to get their statements recorded and the



learned Magistrate was directed to send its report qua the genuineness of the compromise.

4. Pursuant to the aforesaid orders, the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Sirsa has sent reports dated 19.05.2025 to this Court along with the statements of respondent Nos.2 and 3, petitioner/accused and Investigating Officer-ASI Madan Lal, recorded on 17.05.2025.

5. 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 petitioner, there is no other accused in the complaint and that the present petitioner has not been declared proclaimed persons in this case.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and besides perusing the report by learned Judicial Magistrate, have also perused the record.

7. 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. Reference can also be made to another judgment rendered in **Ramawatar vs. State of Madhya Pradesh**, 2021 CrI. L.R. (SC) 1527, wherein, it was observed that the powers under Article 142 or under Section 482 Cr.P.C., are exercisable in post-conviction matters only where an appeal is pending before one or the other Judicial forum. This is on the premise that an order of conviction does not attain finality till the accused has exhausted his/her legal remedies and the finality is sub-judice before an Appellate Court. The pendency of legal proceedings, be that may before the final Court, is sine-qua-non to involve the superior court's plenary powers to do complete justice. Conversely, where a settlement has ensued post the attainment of all legal remedies, the annulment of proceedings on the basis of a compromise would be impermissible. Such an embargo is necessitated to prevent the accused from gaining an indefinite leverage, for such a settlement/compromise will always be loaded with lurking suspicion about its bona fide. It was also observed that the purpose of these extra-ordinary powers was not to incentivise any hollow-hearted agreements between the accused and the victim but to do complete justice by effecting genuine settlement(s).



8. In view of the proposition of law 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 petitioner by quashing of FIR No.168 dated 20.12.2017 registered under Sections 279, 337, 427, 338 of IPC, at Police Station Odhan, District Sirsa and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom as well as judgment of conviction dated 10.04.2023 and order of sentence dated 11.04.2023, on the basis of compromise dated 07.04.2025 (Annexure P-3), would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of legislature enacted under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

9. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and FIR No.168 dated 20.12.2017 registered under Sections 279, 337, 427, 338 of IPC, at Police Station Odhan, District Sirsa and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom as well as judgment of conviction dated 10.04.2023 and order of sentence dated 11.04.2023, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner on the basis of compromise dated 07.04.2025 (Annexure P-3).

10. 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 First Class, Dabwalia, Sirsa.

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

May 28, 2025

Nisha-1

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No