

220

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-20935 of 2013

Date of Decision: February 18, 2015

Amrit Singh alias Shera

.....Petitioner

Vs.

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Vishavjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. V.P.S. Sidhu, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Ishar Lal, Advocate
for the respondents No.2 to 4.

SABINA, J.

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.118 dated 23.06.2012, under Sections 363, 366 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short), registered at Police Station Division No.2, Ludhiana and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Vide order dated 27.08.2013, Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate was directed to record the statements of the parties and send its report with regard to genuineness of the compromise effected between the parties.

On 28.04.2014, following order was passed by this Court:

"The petition is filed praying for quashing the First Information Report No. 118 dated 23.06.2012 registered under Sections 363/366 of the Indian Penal Code at Police Station, Division No. 2, Ludhiana

(Punjab) on the basis of compromise entered into between the parties.

Both the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate. Learned Illaqa Magistrate reported that the parties have suffered the statements voluntarily but learned Illaqa Magistrate has not made any observation as regards the genuineness of the compromise based on the statements suffered by the parties. On a perusal of the statements suffered by the parties before the Illaqa Magistrate, I find that the complainant expressed no objection for quashing the First Information Report lodged by him.

Learned counsel appearing for respondents No. 2 to 4 would now submit that the petitioner and daughter of respondent No. 3 have obtained decree of divorce by mutual consent. The proceedings may be kept in abeyance till then, he submits. He further submits that compromise deed does not reflect this fact. The consent of divorce is to be obtained by the petitioner and daughter of respondent No. 3.

At any rate, it is found that respondents No. 2 to 4 are not agreeable to the quashing of the FIR based on the compromise.

Post the matter on 29.08.2014.”

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner and Krishna Kumari have been granted decree of divorce on the basis of mutual consent vide judgment/order dated 03.11.2014.

Learned counsel for the respondents No.2 to 4 has confirmed the grant of decree of divorce on the basis of mutual consent in favour of the petitioner and Krishna Kumari vide judgment/order dated 03.11.2014.

As per the Full Bench judgment 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.

Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another** 2012 (4) RCR (Crl.) 543, has held as under:-

“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. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity etc; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominatingly civil flavour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their

entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

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.118 dated 23.06.2012, under Sections 363, 366 IPC, registered at Police Station Division No.2, Ludhiana and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are quashed.

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**

February 18, 2015

m.singh