

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****CRMP No. 1314 of 2017**

- Harish Rao S/o M. Appanna, Aged About 42 Years R/o Bharti Nagar, Beside Valani Chamber, Vyapar Vihar, Bilaspur, Police Station Civil Lines, Tahsil & District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

**---- Petitioner****Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh & Anr. Through The Station House Officer Police Station Tarbahar, Bilaspur, Tahsil & District Bilaspur, Chhattisgaon.
2. Dharmendra Singh, S/o Late Shri Govind Singh, Aged About 54 Years R/o Link Road, Bilaspur, Police Station Tarbahar, Bilaspur, Tahsil & District Bilaspur, Chhattisgaon.

**---- Respondents**


---

|                           |   |                                      |
|---------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|
| For Petitioner            | : | Shri Vaibhav Goverdhan, Advocate.    |
| For Respondent No.1/State |   | Shri Anil S. Pandey, Govt. Advocate. |
| For Respondent No.2.      |   | Shri Ravindra Sharma, Advocate.      |

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant****Order On Board****12/10/2017**

Heard.

1. Petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. has been brought with a prayer to quash the criminal proceeding against the petitioner on the basis of compromise with the complainant/respondent No.2.
2. On a complaint made by respondent No.2-Dharmendra Singh, FIR was registered in PS-Tarbahar District-Bilaspur against petitioner No.2 and others. After completion of investigation, charge-sheet has been filed for prosecution in offence under Sections 420, 467, 468, 120-B and 34 of Indian Penal Code (for short 'IPC') against the petitioner and 2 others, as

per the allegations in the FIR. Petitioner was the mediator through whom the siblings of the complainant Dharmendra Singh respondent No.2 got acquainted with the co-accused persons, who gave him an assurance they can arrange as an employment and induce him to pay Rs.20 lakh to them and cheated him. Complainant/respondent No.2 has entered into the compromise with the petitioner. Hence, this petition.

3. Respondent No.2/complainant-Dharmendra Singh has stated on oath before the Additional Registrar Judicial of this Court about the terms of compromise and that he had consented for compromise without any fear, favour or influence. Hence, he wishes that the criminal proceedings against the petitioners be withdrawn.
4. On perusing the documents of charge-sheet, it appears that petitioner is not a main accused of the case. Looking to the nature of the offence for which he is prosecuted, the prayer made can be considered.
5. Consequent to above developments, it appears that the fate of criminal case is already decided and therefore continuation of such criminal proceeding against the petitioners would amount to abuse of process of law. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Another***<sup>1</sup> has laid down the following principles :

“61. 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 accordance with the guidelines engrafted in such

---

1. (2012) 10 SCC 303

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 favour 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.”

6. Keeping in mind the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Gian Singh' case (supra), this Court is of the view that present is a fit case in which inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. can be exercised to quash the criminal proceeding pending against the petitioners.
7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed at the motion stage itself. The criminal proceeding pending against the petitioners before the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Bilaspur in the form of Crime No.40/2017 is hereby quashed.
8. The petition is, accordingly disposed off.

Sd/-

**(Rajendra Chandra Singh Samant)**  
JUDGE