

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

CRM-M-14893 of 2016
Date of decision: 03.08.2017

Mohnish and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present : Mr.Sanjiv Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Ms. Dimple Jain, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

Avneesh Jhingan, J.

Petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.47 dated 03.12.2015, registered under Sections 66E, 67, 67A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 120B, 354(D) and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC' for short), Women, Police Station, Karnal and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise in the shape of affidavit dated 29.04.2016 (Annexure P-2).

Vide order dated 15.12.2016, a direction was given to Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court to record the statements of the parties and to submit a report regarding the genuineness of the compromise effected between the

parties.

In pursuance thereof, the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Karnal has submitted a report dated 23.01.2017, after recording the statements of the parties. The report is received in a sealed cover and opened in the Court. The statements of the complainant-Priyanka Sharma and accused- Mohnish Sharma/Monish Sharma (petitioner No.1) in the present case were recorded. They appeared along with their respective counsel, who identified them and got their statements recorded acknowledging that the compromise had been effected voluntarily, without any coercion or any undue influence.

Neither this fact is disputed by learned State Counsel nor by the counsel for the complainant.

The counsel for the State submits on instructions from Sub Inspector-Gulab Singh that petitioner No.1 is not a proclaimed offender.

The report of the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Karnal further states that in FIR accused were Mohnish Sharma/Monish Sharma, Smt. Sulakshna Devi and Ms. Anju Sharma @ Riya but the police has filed the final report only against accused Mohnish Sharma/Monish Sharma. Smt. Sulakshna Devi and Ms. Anju Sharma @ Riya have been found innocent during investigation.

Learned counsel for the State and counsel for the complainant do not controvert the above position.

As per the Full Bench judgement 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.47 dated 03.12.2015, registered under Sections 66E, 67, 67A of the Information Technology Act, 2000 and Sections 120B, 354(D) and 506 of the IPC, Women, Police Station, Karnal and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua petitioner No.1. The petition qua petitioners No. 2 and 3 has been rendered infructuous.

(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE

03.08.2017

anju

Note:

1. Whether the order is speaking/reasoned : Yes
2. Whether the order is reportable : No