

CRM-M-6990-2020

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

CRM-M-6990-2020 (O & M)

Date of decision: 17.09.2020

Mamta and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Parveen Sharma, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vishal Goel, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

CRM-23056-2020

This is an application under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for early hearing of the main petition, which is fixed for 07.12.2020.

Notice of the application.

On the asking of this Court, Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Mr. Vishal Goel, Advocate, puts in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2.

CRM-M-6990-2020

Learned State counsel and learned counsel for respondent No.2 state that they have no objection, if the present application is allowed.

In view of the above, the present application is allowed and the main petition is preponed to today, itself and taken up on Board.

CRM-M-6990-2020

Prayer has been made for quashing of FIR No.418 dated 23.09.2019, registered under Sections 323, 452 and 506 IPC, at Police Station Gannaur, District Sonipat, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2), alongwith all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Vide order dated 17.02.2020, the trial Court was directed to record the statements of all concerned parties with regard to the genuineness and validity or otherwise of the compromise.

In compliance thereof, Sub Division Judicial Magistrate, Gannaur, has submitted a report vide letter dated 05.03.2020 which indicates that the parties appeared before him 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, voluntarily and without coercion or undue influence.

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.

CRM-M-6990-2020

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

CRM-M-6990-2020

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 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, the petition is allowed. FIR No.418 dated 23.09.2019, registered under Sections 323, 452 and 506 IPC, at Police Station Gannaur, District Sonipat, alongwith all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties, subject to depositing the costs of Rs.10,000/- by the petitioners with the Poor Patients' Welfare Fund of the

CRM-M-6990-2020

Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research (PGIMER),
Chandigarh.

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

17.09.2020
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No