
(2018) 08 P&H CK 0118

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Criminal Miscellaneous-M-2510 of 2018

Jaswinder Singh Joban and Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Punjab and another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 09-08-2018

Acts Referred:

Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 482

Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 148, 149, 323, 324, 326, 341, 506

Citation : (2018) 08 P&H CK 0118

Hon'ble Judges : ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : B.D.Sharma, M.S.NagraKashmir Singh

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No. 219 dated 18.7.2017

filed under Sections 323, 324, 326, 341, 506, 148 and 149 (Sections 324 and 326 added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Rs.IPC' for short),

registered at Police Station A-Division, Amritsar, District Amritsar (Annexure P1), alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the

basis of compromise dated 9.8.2017 (Annexure P2) . Vide order dated 23.4.2018, 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

declared as proclaimed offender.

In pursuance thereof, the trial Court has submitted a report on 27.7.2018 (forwarded by the District and Sessions Judge Amritsar on 31.7.2018), after

recording the statements of the parties. The trial Court has submitted that the

complainant- Karan Khanna and accused-Jaswinder Singh @ Joban, Gurjeet Singh Manna @ Bablu, Deepak Sharma, Gurcharan Singh @ Raju Daburji, Sarwan Arora and Vijay Kumar Arora 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.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from Assistant Sub Inspector-Narayan Singh, has not disputed the fact that there are six accused and none of them have been declared as proclaimed offender.

A perusal of the order dated 10.11.2017 passed by this Court in CRM-M-34223-2017 shows that there were six accused in the FIR No.219 dated 18.7.2017 under Sections 323, 341, 506, 148 and 149 IPC (Sections 324, 326 IPC added subsequently) and the matter had been compromised amongst the complainant-Karan Khanna and accused, namely, Gurcharan Singh @ Raju Doburji, Vijay Kumar Arora, and Sarwan Kumar and the said FIR was quashed qua them.

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.

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.

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

â??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 Sharmaâ??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.â??

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.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No. 219 dated 18.7.2017 filed under Sections 323, 324, 326, 341, 506, 148 and 149 IPC (Sections 324 and 326 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station A-Division, Amritsar, District Amritsar (Annexure P1), is ordered to be quashed subject to payment of costs in the sum of Rs. 3000/- to be deposited 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.