

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

257

Date of Decision: 17.12.2019

CRM-M-47202-2019

Jagraj Singh and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

CRM-M-47605-2019

Malkiat Singh and others

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents.

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. B.S. Sidhu, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CRM-M-47202-2019)
for respondents No.2 to 7 (in CRM-M-47605-2019).

Mr. S.S.Maini, Advocate
for the petitioners (in CRM-M-47605-2019)
for respondents No.2 to 6 (in CRM-M-47202-2019).

Mr. S.S. Cheema, Assistant Advocate General, Punjab.

Harnaresh Singh Gill, J. (Oral)

By this order, I intend to dispose of CRM-M-47202-2019, titled as 'Jagraj Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another' and CRM-M-47605-2019, titled as 'Malkiat Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others', as in both these petitions, prayers have been made for quashing of FIR No.28 dated 27.02.2013, registered at Police Station Raman, District Bathinda, under Sections 323, 324, 336, 427, 506, 120-B, 447, 511 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, and cross-case recorded vide DDR

120-B, 447, 511 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Raman, District Bathinda, arising out of the aforesaid FIR, respectively, on the basis of compromise dated 01.07.2014 alongwith all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Vide orders dated 08.11.2019 (in CRM-M-47605-2019) and dated 05.11.2019 (in CRM-M-47202-2019), the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the genuineness and authenticity of the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Talwandi Sabo, has submitted a consolidated report vide letters dated 04.12.2019 which indicates that the parties appeared before the Magistrate and got recorded their respective statements with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the report, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure or coercion from any corner.

The Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in case **Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052** and Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in case **Sube Singh and another vs. 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.

The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another. 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543** has held 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 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 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.”

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

Since the parties have arrived at a compromise and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose would be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Accordingly, both the petitions are allowed. FIR No.28 dated 27.02.2013, registered at Police Station Raman, District Bathinda, under Sections 323, 324, 336, 427, 506, 120-B, 447, 511 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, and cross-case recorded vide DDR No.28 dated 27.02.2013, under Sections 307, 324, 323, 336, 427, 148, 149, 120-B, 447, 511 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, at Police Station Raman, District Bathinda, arising out of the aforesaid FIR, and all the proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed, qua the petitioners in both the petitions, on the basis of compromise dated 01.07.2014.

Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements made in the Court below.

(Harnaresh Singh Gill)
Judge

17.12.2019
komal

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes/ No

Whether Reportable : Yes/ No