
Ramandeep Kaur and Others Vs State of Punjab and Others

CRM-M-19916-2015

Court: High Court Of Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Date of Decision: July 23, 2015

Acts Referred:

Criminal Procedure Code, 1973 (CrPC) - Section 320, 482#Penal Code, 1860 (IPC) - Section 320, 380, 454, 506

Hon'ble Judges: Rameshwar Singh Malik, J

Bench: Single Bench

Advocate: Ashish Aggarwal, for the Appellant; Daljeet Singh Virk, AAG, Advocates for the Respondent

Final Decision: Allowed

Judgement

Rameshwar Singh Malik, J

The petitioners have approached this Court by way of instant petition under Section 482 of the Code of

Criminal Procedure (for short "Cr.P.C.") invoking its inherent jurisdiction for quashing of FIR No. 88 dated 18.6.2013 registered under Sections

380, 454 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code ("IPC for short), at Police Station, Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural and the consequential

proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2)

2. Notice of motion was issued.

3. In compliance of the order dated 19.6.2015 passed by this Court in CRM-M-20108-2015 (Harjit Kaur and others v. State of Punjab and

others), the parties got their statements recorded before the learned trial court. Consequently, report dated 16.7.2015 sent by the learned Chief

Judicial Magistrate, Amritsar, has been received which is available on record of the case along with the statements of the parties. Learned

Magistrate has reported that the parties have made their statements voluntarily and without any pressure. The compromise arrived at between the

parties has been found to be a genuine one.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties have decided to bury the hatchet and are living peacefully. Learned counsel for the

petitioners further submits that continuation of the impugned FIR and subsequent criminal proceedings arising therefrom, are liable to be quashed in

the interest of justice.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for the State are ad idem that, none of the petitioners is proclaimed offender.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and after going through the record of the case, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a

fit case for exercising the inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C., so as to secure the ends of justice. It is so said because the

parties have arrived at an out of Court settlement by way of compromise (Annexure P-2). The compromise is without any pressure and a genuine

one. In such a situation, continuation of the prosecution would result in sheer abuse of process of law.

7. The above-said view taken by this Court also finds support from the judgment of the Hon"ble Supreme Court of Shiji @ Pappu and Others Vs.

Radhika and Another, AIR 2012 SC 499 : (2012) CriLJ 840 : (2012) 1 JCC 101 : (2011) 13 JT 180 : (2012) 167 PLR 108 : (2012) 1

RCR(Criminal) 9 : (2011) 12 SCALE 588 : (2012) AIRSCW 445 and also from the larger Bench judgment of this Court in Kulwinder Singh and

Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another, (2007) 4 CTC 769 : (2007) 3 RCR(Criminal) 1052 . The observations made by the Hon"ble Supreme

Court in Kulwinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another, (2007) 4 CTC 769 : (2007) 3 RCR(Criminal) 1052 , which can be

gainfully followed in the present case, read as under:

It is manifest that simply because an offence is not compoundable under Section 320 IPC is by itself no reason for the High Court to refuse

exercise of its power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. That power can in our opinion be exercised in cases where there is no chance of recording a

conviction against the accused and the entire exercise of a trial is destined to be an exercise in futility. There is a subtle distinction between

compounding of offences by the parties before the trial Court or in appeal on one hand and the exercise of power by the High Court to quash the

prosecution under Section 482 Cr.P.C. on the other. While a Court trying an accused or hearing an appeal against conviction, may not be

competent to permit compounding of an offence based on a settlement arrived at between the parties in cases where the offences are not

compoundable under Section 320, the High Court may quash the prosecution even in cases where the offences with which the accused stand

charged are non-compoundable. The inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. are not for that purpose controlled by Section

320 Cr.P.C. Having said so, we must hasten to add that the plenitude of the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by itself, makes it obligatory for the

High Court to exercise the same with utmost care and caution. The width and the nature of the power itself demands that its exercise is sparing and

only in cases where the High Court is, for reasons to be recorded, of the clear view that continuance of the prosecution would be nothing but an

abuse of the process of law. It is neither necessary nor proper for us to enumerate the situations in which the exercise of power under Section 482

may be justified. All that we need to say is that the exercise of power must be for securing the ends of justice and only in cases where refusal to

exercise that power may result in the abuse of the process of law. The High court may be justified in declining interference if it is called upon to

appreciate evidence for it cannot assume the role of an appellate court while dealing with a petition under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure

Code. Subject to the above, the High Court will have to consider the facts and circumstances of each case to determine whether it is a fit case in

which the inherent powers may be invoked.

8. The law laid down by the Hon"ble Supreme Court in Shiji's case (supra) has been further reiterated by the Hon"ble Supreme Court in its later

judgments including in the cases of Jayrajsinh Digvijaysinh Rana Vs. State of Gujarat and Another, (2012) CriLJ 3900 : (2012) 3 Crimes 167 :

(2012) 3 JCC 1943 : (2012) 6 JT 504 : (2012) 6 SCALE 525 : (2012) 12 SCC 401 , Gold Quest International Private Limited Vs. The State of

Tamil Nadu, (2014) AIRSCW 6147 : (2014) 10 SCALE 343 , Manohar Singh Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, (2014) AIRSCW 4781 : (2014) 8

SCALE 638 and Narinder Singh and Others Vs. State of Punjab and Another, (2014) AIRSCW 2065 : (2014) CriLJ 2436 : (2014) 4 JT 573 :

(2014) 4 SCALE 195 : (2014) 6 SCC 466 .

9. Reverting back to the facts of the present case, this Court has satisfied itself that the compromise arrived at between the parties is a genuine one.

They have got their statements recorded before the learned trial court, without any pressure. In view of the genuine compromise arrived at between

the parties and also in view of the report received from the learned trial court, this Court feels no hesitation to conclude that the continuation of the

prosecution any further would be nothing but sheer abuse of the process of law. It would result in wastage of valuable time of the Court because

no chance of conviction is left.

10. Considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case noted above, coupled with the reasons aforementioned and to secure the ends of

justice, FIR No. 88 dated 18.6.2013 registered under Sections 380, 454 and 506 IPC at Police Station, Gharinda, District Amritsar Rural and the

consequential proceedings arising therefrom are ordered to be quashed, however, qua the petitioners only.

11. Resultantly, with the above-said observations made, the instant petition stands allowed.