
(2018) 01 P&H CK 0082
In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh
Case No : 8688 of 2016

Jarnail Singh @ Jal Singh and another	APPELLANT
Vs	
State of Punjab and another	RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 10-01-2018

Acts Referred:

[Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973](#), [Section 482](#) - Saving of inherent powers of High Court
[Indian Penal Code, 1860](#), [Section 201](#),
[Section 34](#), [Section 17](#)

Citation : (2018) 01 P&H CK 0082

Hon'ble Judges : Arvind Singh Sangwan

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Dinesh Kumar, Abhaypal Singh Gill, Manish K.Singla

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

1. Petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.136 dated

14.11.2014 under Sections 341, 324, 323, 506 (Section 201 added later on) read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ("IPC" for

short) registered at Police Station Chhajli, District Sangrur (Annexure P1) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of

compromise dated 5.3.2016 (Annexure P2) .

2. Vide order dated 22.7.2016, a direction was given to the trial Court to record the statements of the parties and submit a report regarding the

genuineness of the compromise effected between the parties and also to intimate whether any accused is proclaimed offender.

3. In pursuance thereof, the trial Court has submitted a report dated 8.8.2016 (forwarded by the District and Sessions Judge Sangrur on

10.8.2016), after recording the statements of the parties. The trial Court has submitted that the complainant-Baljit Kaur and accused- Jarnail Singh

@ Jail Singh, Harpreet Kaur @ Preeti Kaur have appeared along with their respective counsel, who had identified them and got their statements

recorded acknowledging that the compromise had been effected voluntarily, without any coercion or any undue influence. This fact is not disputed

by learned State Counsel, who has submitted, on instructions from Head Constable - Ramesh Singh that none of them is proclaimed offenders.

4. Perusal of allegations in the FIR reveals that the present case squarely falls in the category of cases that can be quashed by the High Court, in

exercise of its inherent power under Section 482 of the Code. Keeping in view authoritative enunciation of law laid down by Hon"ble the Supreme

Court of India in ""Gian Singh vs State of Punjab and another"", 2012(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 543 and in the light of facts and circumstances of the

present case, this Court is of the considered opinion that continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to abuse of process of law and it is

expedient in the interest of justice that criminal proceedings are put to an end.

5. As per the Full Bench judgement of this Court in Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, High Court

has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution where the High Court

felt that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of any Court or to otherwise secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing

is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

6. The Apex Court in Central Bureau of Investigation vs. Sadhu Ram Singla and others (2017) 5 Supreme Court Cases 350 has held as under:-

Having carefully considered the singular facts and circumstances of the present case, and also the law relating to the continuance of criminal cases

where the complainant and the accused had settled their differences and had arrived at an amicable arrangement, we see no reason to differ with

the view taken in Manoj Sharma's case (supra) and several decisions of this Court delivered thereafter with respect to the doctrine of judicial

restraint. In concluding hereinabove, we are not unmindful of the view recorded in the decisions cited at the Bar that depending on the attendant

facts, continuance of the criminal proceedings, after a compromise has been

arrived at between the complainant and the accused, would amount to abuse of process of Court and an exercise in futility since the trial would be prolonged and ultimately, it may end in a decision which may be of no consequence to any of the parties.

7. Since the parties have arrived at a compromise and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose would be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

8. Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.136 dated 14.11.2014 under Sections 341, 324, 323, 506 (Section 201 added later on) read

with Section 34 IPC registered at Police Station Chhajli, District Sangrur (Annexure P1) and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom,

are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners by way of compromise subject to the petitioners paying costs in the sum of Rs.5000/- in the Office

of District Legal Services Authority, Amritsar within 8 weeks from today, failing which this order shall stand recalled automatically without

reference to the Court.