

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**CR.M.P. No. 847 of 2018**

Darshan Lal Jaggi, S/o. Shri Saddev Jaggi (wrongly mentioned as Shamshaka Jaggi in the order sheet), Aged About 76 Years, Currently Residing At Quarter No. 201, Block A/2B, 2nd Floor, Golden Tower, Amlidih, P.S. New Rajendra Nagar, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.

---- Petitioner**Versus**

1. State Of Chhattisgarh, Through Collector, Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh.
2. Sonu Garcha, S/o. Late Shri Beant Singh Garcha, Residing At B-9, Awanti Vihar Colony, Telibandha Raipur, District Raipur, Chhattisgarh. Legal Representative Of Late Shri Beant Singh Garcha)

---- Respondents

For Petitioner	:	Mr. Kashif Shakeel, Advocate
For State/Respondent No.1	:	Mr. Akash Pandey, Panel Lawyer
For Respondent No.2	:	Mr. Vivek Shrivastava, Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri**Order On Board****26.02.2019**

Heard

1. The present petition is for quashing of a Complaint Case No.1278/2012 for the offence under Section 420, 468, 471 read with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code, which was initially filed by the father of the respondent No.2.
2. Perusal of the record would show that the complaint was filed by Beant Singh on the ground that Shesh Rao has obtained the loan in his name wherein Darshanlal Jaggi, Prabhulal & Naresh Bani stood as Guarantor. With the subsequent passage of time, Prabhulal & Naresh Bani died and Darshanlal remained in such complaint as accused. Subsequently, Beant Singh also died and his son Sonu Garcha was arrayed as complainant. It is contended that the petitioner Darshanlal

has appeared before the Court of J.M.F.C. on 17.08.2006 pursuant to the order passed by this Court on 17.07.2006 in MCRC No.1779/2006. Subsequently, the matter is pending and the parties have entered into compromise. He submits that statement has also been recorded by the parties, therefore, the petitioner is not absconding and has made his appearance before the Court. He further submits that as per the statement made, the son of the complainant Sonu Garcha do not want any further action against the petitioner in Complaint Case No.1278/2012.

3. Learned counsel for the complainant is present and he also do not object the same. He submits that as per the instructions, the complainant do not want to further prosecute the complaint case, as the complaint was filed by his father.
4. Perused the record. Perusal of the record and the statement would show that the complainant Sonu Garcha has stated that his father has died and compromise has been effected in between the parties, therefore, he do not want to further prosecute the case.
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

1 (2012) 10 SCC 303

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 pre-dominantly 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 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 & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Ors.***² 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

2 (2017) 9 SCC 641

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. The record would show that the petitioner has entered his appearance before the Court below. Considering the submission made by the parties and taking into the statements and since the son of the complainant do not want to further prosecute the complainant as the complainant has died and complaint was of private nature, no purpose would be served to continue the complaint.
8. In view of the above and following the principles laid down by the Supreme Court, the petition is allowed. The Complaint Case No.1278/2012 registered against the petitioner, which is pending for the offence under Section 420, 468, 471 read-with Section 34 of Indian Penal Code is hereby quashed. The petitioner is acquitted of the charges.

Sd/-
(Goutam Bhaduri)
Judge