

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

CRM-M-7721 of 2017 (O&M)
DATE OF DECISION: 24.07.2017

Ranjit Singh @ Rana and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JITENDRA CHAUHAN

Present: None for the petitioners.

Mr. N.K. Banka, DAG, Punjab

JITENDRA CHAUHAN, J.(ORAL)

The present petition is for quashing of FIR No.136 dated 7.6.2014 registered under Section 376-D IPC, at Police Station Bhikhiwind, District Tarn Taran and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise.

It has been averred in the petition that the matter between the petitioners and respondent No.2 has been patched up. Apart from compromise deed (Annexure P-2), the attention of the Court is drawn to the report of the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Patti dated 19.5.2017 affirming the compromise arrived at between the parties. On that basis, it has been averred that the criminal proceedings may be quashed.

Reply on behalf of respondent-State has been filed in the Court, same is taken on record.

Per contra, learned counsel for the State submits that although the matter has been settled between the parties, however, in the offence of rape, the compromise has no legal sanctity and, therefore, the present petition deserves to be dismissed.

I have heard the learned State counsel and carefully perused the entire record on file.

In **Gian Chand vs. State of Punjab and others, (2012) 10 SCC 303**, the Hon'ble apex Court held that the heinous offence, like, rape also falls in the prohibited category and that offence cannot be allowed to be quashed, even though the victim and the offender have settled the dispute, inasmuch as, the aforesaid offence is not private in nature and has serious impact on society. In **State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Madan Lal, (2015) 7 SCC 681**, the Hon'ble apex Court in paras No.15 and 16 has observed as under:-

“15. Having stated the aforesaid, ordinarily we would have proceeded to record our formal conclusion, but, an extremely pertinent and pregnant one, another aspect in the context of this case warrants to be addressed. As it seems to us the learned Single Judge has been influenced by the compromise that has been entered into between the accused and the parents of the victim as the victim was a minor. The learned trial Judge had rejected the said application on the ground that the offence was not compoundable. In this context, it is profitable to reproduce a passage from Shimbhu and Another v. State of Haryana[9] wherein, a three-Judge Bench has ruled thus:-

“Further, a compromise entered into between the parties cannot be construed as a leading factor based on which lesser punishment can be awarded. Rape is a non-compoundable offence and it is an offence against the society and is not a matter to be left for the parties to compromise and settle. Since the Court

cannot always be assured that the consent given by the victim in compromising the case is a genuine consent, there is every chance that she might have been pressurised by the convicts or the trauma undergone by her all the years might have compelled her to opt for a compromise. In fact, accepting this proposition will put an additional burden on the victim. The accused may use all his influence to pressurise her for a compromise. So, in the interest of justice and to avoid unnecessary pressure/harassment to the victim, it would not be safe in considering the compromise arrived at [pic]between the parties in rape cases to be a ground for the Court to exercise the discretionary power under the proviso of Section 376(2) IPC.”

*16. The aforesaid view was expressed while dealing with the imposition of sentence. We would like to clearly state that in a case of rape or attempt of rape, the conception of compromise under no circumstances can really be thought of. These are crimes against the body of a woman which is her own temple. These are offences which suffocate the breath of life and sully the reputation. And reputation, needless to emphasise, is the richest jewel one can conceive of in life. No one would allow it to be extinguished. When a human frame is defiled, the “purest treasure”, is lost. Dignity of a woman is a part of her non-perishable and immortal self and no one should ever think of painting it in clay. There cannot be a compromise or settlement as it would be against her honour which matters the most. It is sacrosanct. Sometimes solace is given that the perpetrator of the crime has acceded to enter into wedlock with her which is nothing but putting pressure in an adroit manner; and we say with emphasis that the Courts are to remain absolutely away from this subterfuge to adopt a soft approach to the case, for any kind of liberal approach has to be put in the compartment of spectacular error. Or to put it differently, it would be in the realm of a sanctuary of error. We are compelled to say so as such an attitude reflects lack of sensibility towards the dignity, the elan vital, of a woman. Any kind of liberal approach or thought of mediation in this regard is thoroughly and completely sans legal permissibility. It has to be kept in mind, as has been held in *Shyam Narain v. State (NCT of Delhi)*[10] that:- “Respect for reputation of women in the society shows the basic civility of a civilised society. No member of society can afford to conceive the idea that he can create a hollow in the honour of a woman. Such thinking is not only lamentable but also deplorable. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the*

thought of sullyng the physical frame of a woman is the demolition of the accepted civilised norm i.e. “physical morality”. In such a sphere, impetuosity has no room. The youthful excitement has no place. It should be paramount in everyone’s mind that, on the one hand, society as a whole cannot preach from the pulpit about social, economic and political equality of the sexes and, on the other, some perverted members of the same society dehumanise the woman by attacking her body and ruining her [pic]chastity. It is an assault on the individuality and inherent dignity of a woman with the mindset that she should be elegantly servile to men.”

In this view of the matter, I find no merit in the present petition and accordingly, it is dismissed.

24.07.2017
ashok

(JITENDRA CHAUHAN)
JUDGE

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