

(2010) 10 P&H CK 0227

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Criminal Miscellaneous No. M- 27586 of 2010 (O and M)

Sudhir Choudhari @ Sanjiv Kumar

APPELLANT

Vs

State of Haryana and Another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 29-10-2010

Acts Referred:

Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) — Section 482

Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) — Section 120(B), 420, 467, 468, 471

Citation : (2010) 10 P&H CK 0227

Hon'ble Judges : Sabina, J

Bench : Single Bench

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Sabina, J.—Petitioner has filed this petition u/s 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of FIR No. 354 dated 15.12.2009, under Sections 420/467/468/471/120B of Indian Penal Code (in short "IPC") registered at Police Station Palam Vihar, District Gurgaon alongwith all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

2. Learned Counsel for the petitioner has submitted that now with the intervention of the relatives and friends parties have arrived at a compromise.

3. Respondent No. 2 is present in person in the Court and has been identified by ASI Dharmesh Kumar, who has come to assist the learned State counsel, and has admitted the factum of compromise between the parties. Original compromise deed has been placed on record. Respondent No. 2 has admitted his signatures on the said compromise deed and has stated that he has no objection if the FIR in question is ordered to be quashed.

4. As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in Kulwinder Singh and Ors. v. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR 1052, High Court has power u/s 482 Code of Criminal Procedure 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.

5. Hon"ble the Apex Court in the case of Nikhil Merchant Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another, in para Nos. 26 and 24 has held as under:-

26. In the instant case, the disputes between the Company and the Bank have been set at rest on the basis of the compromise arrived at by them whereunder the dues of the Bank have been cleared and the Bank does not appear to have any further claim against the Company. What, however, remains is the fact that certain documents were alleged to have been created by the appellant herein in order to avail of credit facilities beyond the limit to which the Company was entitled. The dispute involved herein has overtones of a civil dispute with certain criminal facts. The question which is required to be answered in this case is whether the power which independently lies with this Court to quash the criminal proceedings pursuant to the compromise arrived at, should at all be exercised?

24. On an overall view of the facts as indicated hereinabove and keeping in mind the decision of the Court in B.S. Joshi's case (supra) and the compromise arrived at between the Company and the Bank as also Clause 11 of the consent terms filed in the suit filed by the Bank, we are satisfied that this is a fit case where technicality should not be allowed to stand in the way in the quashing of the criminal proceedings, since, in our view, the continuance of the same after the compromise arrived at between the parties would be a futile exercise.

6. 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.

7. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The FIR No. 354 dated 15.12.2009, under Sections 420/467/468/471/120B of IPC registered at Police Station Palam Vihar, District Gurgaon and consequent proceedings, arising therefrom, are quashed.