

248

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

CRM-M-29600 of 2015

Date of Decision: October 09, 2015

Bishanpreet Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

Present: Mr. A.S. Cheema, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. A.S. Sidhu, AAG Punjab.

Mr. Virender Dhull, 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.107 dated 28.11.2014, under Sections 498-A, 406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short), registered at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that parties have amicably settled their dispute. Vide order Annexure P-3, bail application filed by petitioner No.1 was allowed in view of the compromise effected between the parties. Respondent No.2 had appeared in person before this Court and had submitted her affidavit qua compromise effected between the parties and had admitted the factum of compromise between the parties.

Order dated 28.05.2015 (Annexure P-3) reads as under:

"On the last date of hearing, it was pointed out by the learned State counsel that though the petitioner had joined investigation but certain recoveries were still to be made. Thereafter, learned counsel for the complainant showed willingness on the part of complainant to settle the dispute and consequently, the matter was referred to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre but no settled amount was fixed before the Mediation. Subsequently, the parties have compromised by defining terms and conditions of compromise. Copies of affidavits dated 28.05.2015, executed by the petitioner-Bishanpreet Singh as well as Ramandeep Kaur/complainant have been placed on record. Complainant Ramandeep Kaur along with her father Sh. Lakhwinder Singh are present in Court who have been duly identified by Sh. Varinder Dhull, Advocate. An amount of Rs.4 lacs in cash has been handed over to Ramandeep Kaur/complainant, as per condition of para No.3 of her affidavit. Both the affidavits are taken on record.

Learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the complainant, state that in terms of settlement, necessary proceedings would be initiated before competent courts. Complainant has no objection in case, the interim anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner vide order dated 06.01.2015, is made absolute.

In view of the aforesaid position, the order dated 06.01.2015 is made absolute.

Petition stands disposed of."

Annexure P-4 is the affidavit tendered by respondent No.2 in Crl. Misc. No.M-121 of 2015 (bail petition). Para 5 of the said affidavit reads as under:-

"5. That the deponent has no objection if the above FIR No.107 dated 28.11.2014, under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC, Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa is quashed by this Hon'ble Court. Deponent is bound to record her statement regarding compromise. Even deponent shall have no objection if the above FIR is quashed in her absence without recording her statement."

Learned counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for respondent No.2 have submitted that in pursuance to the compromise effected between the parties, petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 have filed petition under

Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955.

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-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 served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.107 dated 28.11.2014, under Sections 498-A, 406 IPC, registered at Police Station City Budhlada, District Mansa and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are quashed.

(SABINA)
JUDGE

October 09, 2015
mahavir