

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

.....

Criminal Misc. No.M-24703 of 2017

.....

Date of decision:10.11.2017

Ashok Kumar and another

.....Petitioners

v.

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

....

Coram: Hon'ble Mr. Justice Inderjit Singh

.....

Present: Mr. Kiran Vema, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Kuldeep Sharma, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana for
the respondent-State.

Ms. Monika Jangra, Advocate for complainant-respondent
No.2.

.....

Inderjit Singh, J.

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of cross-case DDR No.23 dated 8.5.2014 registered for the offences under Sections 148, 149, 323 and 506 IPC at Police Station Guhla in FIR No.54 dated 7.5.2014 (Annexure-P.1) registered at Police Station Guhla, District Kaithal; judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 19.3.2016/21.3.2016 passed by Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Guhla (Annexures-P.3 and P.4) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom in view of the compromise (Annexure-P.6).

The cross case DDR has been registered on the statement of

complainant-Rekha Rani on the allegations that the accused-petitioners attacked her and inflicted injuries. After trial, the petitioners were convicted for the offences under Sections 323 and 506 read with Section 34 IPC and they were acquitted for the offence under Section 325 IPC. The petitioners vide order dated 21.3.2016 were sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months and to pay a fine of ₹500 each and in default of payment of fine to further undergo simple imprisonment for 15 days each for the offence under Section 323 IPC read with Section 34 IPC. They were further sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for six months each and to pay a fine of ₹500/- each and in default of payment of fine to further undergo simple imprisonment for 15 days each for the offence under Section 506 read with Section 34 IPC. Both the sentences were ordered to run concurrently. Thereafter, the petitioners filed appeal against the impugned judgment and order before the learned Sessions Judge, Kaithal, which is pending. During the pendency of appeal, with the intervention of the respectable persons of both the parties on 3.6.2017, a written compromise has been effected between the parties and in view of the above said compromise, respondent No.2 does not want to proceed with the case.

Keeping in view the fact that the parties have entered into a compromise, they were directed to appear before learned trial Court for getting their statements recorded in support of the compromise. After doing the needful, learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Guhla, has sent his report dated 13.10.2017 submitting that the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and has been effected between the parties of their own

free will and without pressure from any quarter.

Learned Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, on instructions from the Investigating Officer and learned counsel for complainant-respondent No.2 admit the factum of compromise and submit that in case the parties have indeed settled their dispute, the State would have no objection to the quashing of the cross-case DDR in the FIR in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as learned State counsel and have gone through the record.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in Dr. Arvind Barsaul etc. v. State of Madhya Pradesh and another, 2008 (2) R.C.R. (Cr.) 910, has held that proceedings after conviction can be quashed.

This Court in Sube Singh and another v. State of Haryana and another, 2013 (4) R.C.R. (Cr.) 102, has held as under:-

“In the light of these peculiar facts and circumstances where not only the parties but their close relatives (including daughter and son-in-law of respondent No.2) have also supported the amicable settlement, we are of the considered view that the negation of the compromise would disharmonize the relationship and cause a permanent rift amongst the family members who are living together as a joint family. Non-acceptance of the compromise would also lead to denial of complete justice which is the very essence of our justice delivery system. Since there is no statutory embargo against

invoking of power under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code after conviction of an accused by the trial Court and during pendency of appeal against such conviction, it appears to be a fit case to invoke the inherent jurisdiction and strike down the proceedings subject to certain safeguards.”

This Court in Satya Narain v. State of Haryana, 2009 (3) R.C.R. (Cr.) 97 and Lal Chand v. The State of Haryana, 2009 (5) R.C.R. (Cr.) 838, has held that High Court is vested with unparallel power to quash criminal proceedings at any stage to secure ends of justice. The parties have buried their hatchet, though at a belated stage, it was held, that if compromise is accepted and proceedings are quashed, it will go a long way, to create better relations between the parties. Therefore, it was observed that it is a fit case for quashing of FIR, conviction and sentence recorded by the trial Court.

In a decision, based on compromise, none of the parties is a loser. Rather, compromise not only brings peace and harmony between the parties to a dispute, but also restores tranquility in the society. After considering the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, continuance of criminal prosecution would be an exercise in futility, as the chances of ultimate conviction are bleak.

Therefore, keeping in view the fact that the matter has been amicably settled between both the parties and the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Cr.) 543, and Dr. Arvind Barsaul etc. v. State of Madhya Pradesh

and another (supra) and by this Court in Sube Singh and another v. State of Haryana and another (supra), Satya Narain v. State of Haryana (supra), and Lal Chand v. The State of Haryana (supra), this petition is allowed. Cross-case DDR No.23 dated 8.5.2014 registered for the offences under Sections 148, 149, 323 and 506 IPC at Police Station Guhla in FIR No.54 dated 7.5.2014 (Annexure-P.1) registered at Police Station Guhla, District Kaithal; judgment of conviction and order sentence dated 19.3.2016/21.3.2016 passed by Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Guhla (Annexures-P.3 and P.4) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are hereby quashed/set aside on the basis of compromise qua the petitioners only.

November 10, 2017.

(Inderjit Singh)
Judge

hsp

NOTE:	Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes
	Whether reportable:	No