

115

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

**CRM-M-29530 of 2015**

**Date of Decision: September 02, 2015.**

Pradeep

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA**

**Present:** Mr. Minderjeet Yadav, Advocate  
for the petitioner.

\*\*\*\*

**SABINA, J.**

Petitioner has filed this petition under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking quashing of FIR No.702 dated 31.07.2015, under Sections 376 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short), registered at Police Station Sadar, Gurgaon and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise.

Heard.

Prosecution story, in brief, is that the prosecutrix came in contact with the petitioner about six years prior to the registration of the FIR. Petitioner had promised to perform marriage with the prosecutrix and due to this reason, he had developed physical relations with her. When the complainant pressurized the petitioner to perform marriage with her, he told her that he could not marry her and she should get married elsewhere. When the petitioner came to know that

the prosecutrix had got married, he sent her obscene photographs to her husband and due to this reason, her husband divorced her. Petitioner stated that he would also divorce his wife and would perform marriage with the prosecutrix. However, later prosecutrix came to know that the petitioner was already married and was having two children.

In the present case, FIR has been registered against the petitioner qua commission of offence punishable under Section 376 IPC.

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 in the present case, FIR has been registered under Section 376 IPC, no ground for quashing of FIR No.702 dated 31.07.2015, under Section 376 IPC, registered at Police Station Sadar, Gurgaon and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise, is made out.

Dismissed.

**(SABINA)  
JUDGE**

**September 02, 2015**  
mahavir