

**CRM-M-3742-2025**

261

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**CRM-M-3742-2025**

Date of Decision : 24.04.2025

Sunil Kumar and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

Babli and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE KIRTI SINGH

Present: Ms. Manpreet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Akash Mehta, Advocate for the petitioners

Ms. Shalini Atri, Advocate
for respondents No. 1 and 2

Ms. Aakanksha Gupta, AAG Punjab

KIRTI SINGH, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 for quashing of complaint No.40 dated 18.05.2018, under Sections 452, 354, 323, 325 and 34 IPC pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rajpura along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 22.08.2024 (Annexure P-4) effected between the parties.

2. Learned State counsel on instructions submits that there are in total seven accused persons and six have recorded their statements before the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rajpura and qua Sunil Kumar-petitioner No. 1, who is juvenile and complaint qua him was dismissed as withdrawn on 08.03.2025 and he was discharged by the National Lok Adalat, ACJ(SD), RC cum JMIC, Patiala. She has placed on record copy of the order dated 08.03.2025 passed by Presiding Officer, National Lok Adalat, ACJ(SD), RC cum JMIC, Patiala, which is taken on record as Annexure 'A1'.



CRM-M-3742-2025

2

2. Heard learned counsel for the parties and also gone through the case file.
3. This Court while issuing notice of motion vide order dated 27.01.2025, directed the parties to appear before the Area Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements with regard to the compromise.
4. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 03.03.2025 has been received from the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rajpura. A perusal of the said report reveals that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the present case, who have stated that the matter has been settled between them and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. The compromise effected between them is genuine, without any undue influence and coercion.
5. The Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, held that 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 is of the view that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.
6. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in the case of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543***, had observed that in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court, inherent power can be used by this Court to quash criminal proceedings in which a compromise has been effected. The relevant portion of para 57 of the said judgment reads thus:-

“57. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction



is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code.

Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court.

xxx

xxx

xxx. ”

7. In view of the afore-referred judgments, perusing the report of the trial Court regarding amicable settlement between the petitioners and the complainant, this Court finds that quashing the FIR will accord a quietus to all disputes between the parties and it is in the interest of both sides to bury the hatchet and lead a peaceful life. Thus, no useful purpose would be served in continuing the proceedings and in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings in the present case deserve to be quashed.

8. Resultantly, the present petition is allowed and complaint No.40 dated 18.05.2018, under Sections 452, 354, 323, 325 and 34 IPC pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rajpura and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua petitioners No. 2 to 7 on the basis of compromise dated 22.08.2024 (Annexure P-4) ***subject to the costs of Rs. 20,000/- to be deposited in the Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh within one month.***

24.04.2025

reena

(KIRTI SINGH)
JUDGE

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