

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CRMP No. 402 of 2018**

Madwari Ram S/o Sonwa Das Panika Aged About 50 Years R/o
Kakna, Nawapara, Chowki Bariyon, P. S. Rajpur, District
Balrampur Chhattisgarh.....(Accused). **--- Petitioner**

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh through District Magistrate, District
Balrampur Chhattisgarh.
2. Smt. Manti Giri W/o Bablu Giri R/o Kakna, Nawapara, Chowki
Bariyon, P. S. Rajpur, District Balrampur Ramnujganj
Chhattisgarh.....(Complainant) **--- Respondents**

For Petitioner : Mr. Apoorva Tripathi,, Advocate
For Respondent No.1/State : Mr. Vaibhav Goverdhan, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order On Board**04.10.2018**

1. The instant petition is against the order dated 22.11.2017 passed by the learned Court of the Second Additional Judge of the Court of Additional Sessions Judge, Ramanujganj in Criminal Appeal No. R-20/2015 whereby the applications filed u/s 320(1) & 320(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure for compounding the offence were dismissed.
2. Petitioner Madwari Ram was convicted by judgment/order dated 28.05.2015 passed by the CJM Balrampur in Criminal Case No.250/2014 for the offence punishable u/s 354 of IPC and was sentenced to undergo R.I., for one and half years along-with fine of Rs.1000/-, in absence of payment of fine, he was further directed to undergo additional R.I., for four months. The said order of conviction was subject of challenge

in appeal which was pending before the Additional Sessions Judge, Ramanujganj. During the pendency of appeal, applications under section 320(1) & 320(2) of Cr.P.C., were filed by the accused which were dismissed by order dated 22.11.2017, therefore, this instant petition.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have settled the dispute and categorical statements have been made by the victim that she do not want to further prosecute her complaint and want to compound the offence. The statement of the victim was recorded before the Additional Registrar (Judicial), therefore, the judgment of conviction and sentence dated 25.08.2015 may be set aside.
4. Perused the record. A perusal of the record would show that the statement of the victim was recorded before the Additional Registrar (Judicial) wherein the victim has stated that she filed complaint u/s 354 of IPC bearing FIR No.165/2014 which subsequently matured into Criminal Case bearing No.250/2014 before the CJM, Balrampur, Ramanujganj. After such adjudication, the criminal appeal No.20/2015 was preferred by the petitioner, which was pending before the ASJ, Balrampur. She has further deposed that during pendency of such appeal, she has entered into compromise with her neighbor. the petitioner herein, and she do not want to further prosecute her complaint. She further deposed that the compromise has been effected without fear, pressure or undue influence or coercion.
5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Gian Singh v. State of*

Punjab & Another¹ 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 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 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

1 (2012) 10 SCC 303

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. Further, in case of ***Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur*** in Criminal Appeal No.1723 of 2017 their Lordship again reiterated the view taken in case of ***Gian Singh*** (supra) and has laid down the following propositions :

“15. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions :

(i) Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court;

(ii) The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a First Information Report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal

Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

(iii) In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power;

(iv) While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court;

(v) The decision as to whether a complaint or First Information Report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated;

(vi) In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences;

(vii) As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing in so far as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned;

(viii) Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute;

(ix) In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

(x) There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions (viii) and (ix) above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the state have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”

7. In view of the aforesaid principles and considering the statement of the victim recorded before the Addl. Registrar (J) as also the nature of the complaint, I am inclined to quash the Criminal Proceedings and the FIR bearing No.165/2014 which was registered u/s 354 of IPC against the petitioner. Accordingly, the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 28.05.2015 passed by CJM, Balrampur, in Criminal Case No.250/2014 against the petitioner is set aside. The petitioner is acquitted of the charge. Consequently the FIR No.165/2014 registered at Police Station Rajpur stands quashed.

8. In the result the petition is allowed.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge