

CRM-M-9895-2012

[1]

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh.

CRM-M-9895-2012 (O&M)
Date of Decision:26.08.2015

Smt. Santosh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

Bhupinder Singh

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE SABINA

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

Respondent in person alongwith
Mr. S.K. Verma, Advocate.

SABINA, J.

Petitioners have filed this petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of complaint No.521-2 dated 22.12.2006 and orders dated 26.08.2008, 16.10.2009, 28.04.2009 and 06.07.2011 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

Learned counsel for the parties have submitted that parties have amicably settled their dispute. In fact petitioners had executed an agreement to sell in favour of complainant and his brother Ravinder Singh on 12.06.2006. In the civil litigation, suit filed by the complainant and his brother for specific performance of agreement to sell in question was

CRM-M-9895-2012

[2]

decreed to the extent that the petitioners were liable to return the amount of earnest money i.e. ₹5,00,000/- along with simple interest @ 9% per annum from 12.06.2006 till its actual payment. Against the said decree dated 08.10.2013, passed by the trial court, both the sides have preferred appeals and the same were pending.

Today, learned counsel for the petitioners has handed over the draft in the name of respondent and his brother Ravinder Singh in the sum of Rs.9,14,500/- to the respondent, who is present in person. (Photocopy of the draft has been placed on record)

Learned counsel for the parties have submitted that in pursuance to the compromise, parties will withdraw the appeal pending before the Appellate Court with regard to the suit filed by the respondent for specific performance of agreement to sell.

Learned counsel for the respondent has further submitted that plaintiffs will not seek the execution of the decree passed by the trial Court dated 08.10.2013 and the respondent has no objection, if the criminal complaint in question and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed. In this regard, affidavit of respondent is taken on record.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in

CRM-M-9895-2012

[3]

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

CRM-M-9895-2012

[4]

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 predominatingly 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

CRM-M-9895-2012

[5]

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. complaint No.521-2 dated 22.12.2006 and orders dated 26.08.2008, 16.10.2009, 28.04.2009 and 06.07.2011 and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are quashed.

August 26, 2015
kapil

**(SABINA)
JUDGE**