

CRM-M-22517-2015

[1]

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh.

CRM-M-22517-2015

Date of Decision: 16.11.2015

Pardeep Saini and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. Balram Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. A.S. Sidhu, AAG, Punjab.

Respondent No.2 in person with
Mr. Pawan Sharma, Advocate for
Mr. B.D. Sharma, Advocate.

SABINA, J.

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.13, dated 24.02.2010, under Sections 406 and 498-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short), registered at Police Station Bhogpur, District Jalandhar, order dated 21.01.2011 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioners as well as counsel for respondent No.2 have submitted that now parties

CRM-M-22517-2015

[2]

have amicably settled their dispute. Learned counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 have filed a petition for divorce on the basis of mutual consent under Section 13B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. It has been further agreed between the parties that the petitioners shall pay ₹35,00,000/- to respondent No.2 by way of full and final settlement of her claim including dowry articles and permanent alimony. No child was born out of the wedlock of petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has handed over three drafts in the sum of ₹5,00,000/- each to respondent No.2.

Respondent No.2 is present in person and has admitted the factum of compromise between the parties. She has also admitted the contents of her affidavit, Annexure P-5. As per Annexure P-5, respondent No.2 had stated that she has no objection if the proceedings against the petitioners are quashed in view of the compromise effected between the parties. Respondent No.2 has further stated that in terms of the compromise effected between the parties, she had already received ₹20,00,000/- from the petitioners and has received three drafts in the sum of ₹5,00,000/- each from the counsel for the petitioners today in the Court. She has stated that in all, now she has received ₹35,00,000/- from the petitioners in

CRM-M-22517-2015

[3]

terms of the compromise and has no objection if the FIR in question is ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

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

CRM-M-22517-2015

[4]

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-dominantly 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

CRM-M-22517-2015

[5]

served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.13, dated 24.02.2010, under Sections 406 and 498-A IPC, registered at Police Station Bhogpur, District Jalandhar, order dated 21.01.2011 and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are quashed.

November 16, 2015
kapil

(SABINA)
JUDGE