

CRM-M-9572 of 2018

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

CRM-M-9572 of 2018
Date of Decision: 14.08.2018

Pal Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: - Mr. Rajesh Bhatheja, Advocate, for the petitioners.
Mr. Amandeep S. Gill, DAG, Punjab.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been made for quashing complaint No.183/16.09.2002 dated 11.09.2001 under Sections 307, 392, 450, 427, 440, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, titled “Harjit Kaur v. Pal Singh” along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-3).

Pursuant to order dated 03.07.2018 of this Court, the parties appeared before learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Faridkot on 19.07.2018 to get their statements recorded. Learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Faridkot, has submitted her report vide letter bearing No.406 dated 27.07.2018 duly forwarded by learned District and Sessions Judge, Faridkot vide letter No.2372/EB. Dated 31.07.2018.

It is apt to mention that vide judgment of conviction dated 12.03.2009 of the trial Court, the petitioners were held guilty and sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for one year each under Sections 148 and

36/9 IPC each. To undergo rigorous imprisonment for one month each under Section 447 IPC and to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years each

CRM-M-9572 of 2018

under Section 506 IPC.

According to the report, learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Faridkot, is satisfied that parties have arrived at compromise without any pressure and same is genuine.

The question is as to whether compounding of offence can be permitted even at the appellate stage after conviction of an accused on the basis of compromise. The relevant portion of the judgment by a Division Bench of this Court in Sube Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and another, 2013(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 102 is reproduced as under:-

“(11) The extent and sweep of inherent power exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 CrPC for quashing the criminal proceedings on the basis of compromise between the offender and the victim of crime in a case which is not compoundable under Section 320 CrPC, has since been considered in extenso and answered by the Hon’ble Supreme Court in Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr., (2012) 4 RCR (Crl.) 543, laying down that the compounding of offence and quashing of criminal proceedings are two separate things and not interchangeable and that the two powers are distinct and different although ultimate consequence may be the same. It has been authoritatively ruled that where the offender and victim have settled their dispute, the High Court in exercise of its inherent power under Section 482 CrPC, is competent to quash criminal proceedings even relating to the non-compoundable offences though such a power need to be invoked sparingly and not when the offences are heinous, serious, of mental depravity or like murder, rape, dacoity etc. The pronouncement thus says:-

“53. Quashing of offence or criminal proceedings on the ground of settlement between an offender and victim is not the same thing as compounding of offence. They are different and not interchangeable. Strictly speaking, the power of compounding of offences given

to a court under Section 320 is materially different from the quashing of criminal proceedings by the High Court in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction. In compounding of offences, power of a criminal court is circumscribed by the provisions contained in Section 320 and the court is guided solely and squarely thereby while, on the other hand, the formation of opinion by the High Court for quashing a criminal offence or criminal proceeding or criminal complaint is guided by the material on record as to whether the ends of justice would justify such exercise of power although the ultimate consequence may be acquittal or dismissal of indictment.

*(12) The decision in Gian Singh's case (supra) also approves the view taken by a five-Judge Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.**, 2007(3) RCR (Crl.) 1052.*

(13) It is indeed now unarguable to say that the power exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 CrPC for the quashing of criminal prosecution is limited or affected by the provision of Section 320 CrPC.

(15) The refusal to invoke power under Section 320 CrPC, however, does not debar the High Court from resorting to its inherent power under Section 482 CrPC and pass an appropriate order so as to secure the ends of justice.

(17) The magnitude of inherent jurisdiction exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 CrPC with a view to prevent the abuse of law or to secure the ends of justice, however, is wide enough to include its power to quash the proceedings in relation to not only the non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 CrPC but such a power, in our considered view, is exercisable at any stage save that there is no express bar and invoking of such power is fully justified on facts and circumstances of the case."

Considering the aforesaid dictum in **Sube Singh's** case (supra)

CRM-M-9572 of 2018

and the fact that there is no statutory embargo against invoking powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. after conviction of accused by the trial Court and during pendency of the appeal against such conviction and further that the compromise will bring peace and harmony in relations between the parties, complaint No.183/16.09.2002 dated 11.09.2001 under Sections 307, 392, 450, 427, 440, 148, 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, titled “Harjit Kaur v. Pal Singh” along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed qua petitioners No.1, 2 and 4 except petitioner No.3-Gamdoor Singh, subject to payment of costs of ₹10,000/-, out of which ₹6,000/- shall be deposited with the Punjab State Legal Services Authority and ₹4,000/- with the Bar Council of Punjab and Haryana.

Petition is disposed of accordingly.

List on 14.09.2018 for production of receipt with regard to deposit of aforesaid costs.

August 14, 2018
R.S.

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No