

CRM-M-27490-2014

[1]

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh.

CRM-M-27490-2014

Date of Decision:14.09.2015

Arvinder Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

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

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

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Banga, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

SABINA, J.

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.116 dated 08.06.2009, under Sections 306 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short) registered at Police Station Mehta, District Amritsar (Rural) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that petitioner No.2 is the brother of deceased. In fact a property dispute was going on between the brothers, which

CRM-M-27490-2014

[2]

has now been duly settled between the parties. Dalip Singh committed suicide by consuming poison and the FIR was lodged by respondent No.2 against the petitioners on the basis of suspicion that he had committed suicide on account of property dispute pending between him (Dalip Singh) and his brother (petitioner No.2). Deceased had not left behind any suicide note. After investigation of the case, cancellation report had been prepared by the Investigating Agency.

Learned counsel for the respondent No.2 has not controverted the submissions made by learned counsel for the petitioners.

Vide order dated 19.08.2014, Area 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.

In pursuance to the said order, the Magistrate, after recording the statements of the parties, has reported that the compromise effected between the parties was without any undue influence or pressure.

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

CRM-M-27490-2014

[3]

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-dominantly civil flavour stand on different footing

CRM-M-27490-2014

[4]

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.”

Although, in the present case, FIR has been registered under Section 306, IPC but it would be a debatable issue as to whether offence under Section 306 IPC has been committed by the petitioners or not. Deceased had not left behind any suicide note and a property dispute was pending between the deceased and his brother. It is probable that the FIR in question might have been got registered by respondent No.2, who is son of the deceased, against the petitioners on account of pendency of property dispute between the parties.

CRM-M-27490-2014

[5]

After investigation of the case, cancellation report has been prepared by the Investigating Agency. However, now parties have amicably settled their dispute, hence, no useful purpose would be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue. Rather continuation of criminal proceedings against the petitioners would be nothing but an abuse of process of law.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.116 dated 08.06.2009, under Sections 306 and 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Mehta, District Amritsar (Rural) and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are quashed.

September 14, 2015
kapil

(SABINA)
JUDGE