

CRM-M-20569 of 2018

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

CRM-M-20569 of 2018
Date of Decision: 20.09.2018

Puran Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Mr. Amit Arora, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Harpreet Multani, AAG, Punjab.
Mr. N.P.S. Mann, Advocate, for respondents No.2 to 4.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been made for quashing FIR No.7 dated 11.01.2018 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 307, 353, 186, 506, 148, 149 and 323 IPC at Police Station Sadar Tam Taran, District Tarn Taran, and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

Pursuant to order dated 12.07.2018 of this Court, the parties appeared before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate on 30.08.2018 to get their statements recorded. Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, has submitted her report vide letter bearing No.226, dated 06.09.2018 duly forwarded by learned District and Sessions Judge, Tarn Taran, vide Endst. No.4942-R, dated 06.09.2018.

According to the report, learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran, is satisfied that compromise entered into

CRM-M-20569 of 2018

between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any sort of pressure, threat or coercion from any corner.

In the instant case, quashment of FIR has been sought under Section 307 IPC. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another*, 2014(2) RCR (Criminal) 482 has held as under: -

“31 (VI) Offences under Section 307 IPC would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore is to be generally treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of Section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of Section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to proving the charge under Section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delegate parts of the body, nature of weapons used etc. Medical report in respect of injuries suffered by the victim can generally be the guiding factor. On the basis of this prima facie analysis, the High Court can examine as to whether there is a strong possibility of conviction or the chances of conviction are remote and bleak. In the former case it can refuse to accept the settlement and quash the criminal proceedings whereas in the later case it would be permissible for the High Court to accept the plea compounding the offence based on complete settlement between the parties. At this stage, the Court can also be swayed by the fact that the settlement between the parties is going to result in harmony between them which may

CRM-M-20569 of 2018

improve their future relationship.”

In Jagroop Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others in CRM-M No.16154 of 2016 decided on 01.03.2017, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in para No. 8 of the judgment has observed as under:

“{8}. In nutshell each case has to be considered on its own merits. While exercising inherent powers, High Court has to examine whether possibility of conviction is bleak and continuation of proceedings would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and would result in futility. Offence under Section 307 IPC falls under the category of heinous offence and generally it is to be treated offence against the State/society and not an individual offence. At the same time High Court would not base its decision merely because offence under Section 307 IPC is mentioned in the FIR or in the charge. It is still open before the Court as to whether insertion of offence under Section 307 IPC is based on evidence or it is just for the sake of incorporation in the FIR.”

In view of the totality of the facts and circumstances and considering the fact that the compromise will bring harmony in relations between the parties, the petition is allowed and the aforesaid FIR No.7 dated 11.01.2018 and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed, subject to payment of costs of ₹10,000/-, out of which ₹4,000/- shall be deposited with the Bar Association of Punjab and Haryana High Court, ₹1,000/- with the Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana and ₹5,000/- with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Legal Services Committee within

one week from today, failing which this petition shall be deemed to

CRM-M-20569 of 2018

be dismissed.

Disposed of accordingly.

List on 17.10.2018, for production of receipt with regard to
deposit of aforesaid costs.

September 20, 2018
R.S.

(Ramendra Jain)
Judge

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No