

...

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRR-823-2018 (O&M)

Date of Decision : February 01 , 2019

Varinder Kumar Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SHEKHER DHAWAN.

Argued by Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Vikramjit Singh, Addl. A.G., Haryana
for respondent-State .

Mr. Vikas Sonak, Advocate,
for respondent no.2.

SHEKHER DHAWAN, J.

Present revision petition against judgment of conviction dated 01.08.2016 and order of sentence dated 02.08.2016 passed by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ambala vide which the petitioner was convicted under Section 406 of Indian Penal Code and Section 76 of Chit Funds Act, 1982 for short, “the Act”] and was sentenced as under:-

Under Section Sentence In default

U/S 406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.	To undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for the period of six months and to pay a fine of Rs.500/-.	In default of payment of fine, the convict was further ordered to undergo of Simple Imprisonment for a period of one month.
U/S 76 of Chit Funds Act, 1982	To undergo Rigorous Imprisonment for the period of six months and to pay a fine of Rs.500/-	

...

2. The appeal filed by the revisionist was dismissed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala vide judgment dated 23.02.2018. Hence, the petitioner has preferred this revision petition against the aforesaid judgment of conviction dated 1.8.2016 and order of sentence dated 2.8.2016 passed by learned trial Court and judgment dated 23.02.2018 passed by the 1st Appellate Court.

3. During the pendency of the present revision petition, an application bearing CRM-8507-2018 was filed by the petitioner seeking permission to compromise the matter after conviction and vide order dated 22.11.2018, this Court directed learned trial Court to record the statements of all the concerned parties, with regard to the genuineness and validity or otherwise of the compromise.

4. In compliance thereof, report of Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ambala has been received through District & Sessions Judge, Ambala in which, it has been mentioned that a genuine compromise has been effected between the parties.

5. Learned counsel for the parties relied upon the judgment passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court in case “**Joginder Ram and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2009(1) RCR (Criminal) 495**” wherein the appellant was acquitted under Section 323 IPC on the basis of compromise, after conviction by the lower Court.

6. The Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in case “**Kulwinder Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**” and Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in case “**Sube Singh and another v. State of Haryana and another, 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102**” observed that compounding of offence can be allowed even after

...

conviction, during proceedings of the appeal against conviction pending in Sessions Court and in case of involving non-compoundable offence.

7. An identical question came to be decided by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another, 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543**. Having interpreted the relevant provisions and considering a line of the judgment on the pointed points, it was ruled (para 57) as under:-

“57. 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 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 personnel 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.”

8. The same view was again reiterated by Hon'ble the Apex Court in case **“Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) RCR (Criminal) 482.**

9. Learned counsel for the parties contended that after recording of judgment of conviction and order of sentence, the parties have mutually settled their dispute and the matter in controversy revolves around private litigation qua financial transactions effecting the parties only and not the society at large. As per custody certificate dated 29.1.2019, the petitioner has already undergone 1 month and 10 days of total sentence against the awarded sentence of 6 months.

10. Identical matter was before the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in **Sube Singh's case (supra)**, wherein it has been observed as under:-

“(21). In the light of these peculiar facts and circumstances

...

where not only the parties but their close relatives (including daughter and son-in-law of respondent No.2) have also supported the amicable settlement, we are of the considered view that the negation of the compromise would disharmonize the relationship and cause a permanent rift amongst the family members who are living together as a joint family. Non-acceptance of the compromise would also lead to denial of complete justice which is the very essence of our justice delivery system. Since there is no statutory embargo against invoking of power under Section 482 Cr.P.C after conviction of an accused by the trial Court and during pendency of appeal against such conviction, it appears to be a fit case to invoke the inherent jurisdiction and strike down the proceedings subject to certain safeguards.”

11. Having considered the contentions raised by learned counsel for the parties and the fact that the parties have settled their dispute amicably and the matter in controversy is such that the same is effecting the parties inter-se and not against the society at large, the compromise has been arrived at with the intervention of the respectable and family members and the parties have decided to keep harmony between them and to live peacefully in future, and that the petitioner has already undergone 1 month and 05 days of total sentence against the awarded sentence of 6 months, it would be in the interest of justice that parties are allowed to compromise the matter and the petitioner has already undergone 1 month and 10 days of total sentence against the awarded sentence of 6 months.

12. In view of above, present revision petition is accepted and FIR No. 209 dated 21.04.2010 under Sections 406, 420 and 506 IPC registered at Police Station Ambala Cantt and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed on the basis of compromise having

...

been entered into between the parties.

13. Resultantly, the impugned judgment of conviction dated 01.08.2016 and order of sentence dated 02.08.2016 passed by Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ambala and judgment dated 23.02.2018 passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ambala are set aside.

14. The present revision petition stands allowed in the above terms.

(SHEKHER DHAWAN)
JUDGE

February 01, 2019
som

Whether speaking/reasoned? :	Yes
Whether reportable? :	Yes