

**CRM-M-26090-2019 and
CRM-M-25953-2019**

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

Date of Decision: 26.02.2020

1. CRM-M-26090-2019

Kewal Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

AND

2. CRM-M-25953-2019

Jatinder Singh and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. I.S.Mann, Advocate for
Mr. Arman Mahajan, Advocate,
for the petitioners in CRM-M-26090-2019 and
for respondents No.2 and 3 in CRM-M-25953-2019.

Mr. Dhruv Dayal, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gagandeep Singh Simble, Advocate,
for the respondents No.2 and 3 in CRM-M-26090-2019 and
for the petitioners in CRM-M-25953-2019.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J.(Oral)

By this order, I intend to dispose of CRM-M-26090-2019, titled

**CRM-M-26090-2019 and
CRM-M-25953-2019**

as 'Kewal Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others', and CRM-M-25953-2019, titled as 'Jatinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others', as in both these petitions, prayers have been made for quashing of FIR No.10 dated 24.01.2018, under Sections 324, 323, 336, 506, 427, 148 and 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Fatehgarh Churian, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur, and DDR No.29 dated 25.01.2018, under Sections 324, 148 and 149 IPC, arising out of the aforesaid FIR, respectively, on the basis of compromise dated 09.03.2019 (Annexure P-3 in both these petitions), alongwith all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

Vide orders dated 22.11.2019 passed by this Court, the trial Court was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the genuineness and authenticity of the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Batala, has submitted the separate reports vide letters dated 04.01.2020 which indicate that the parties had appeared before the Magistrate and got their respective statements recorded with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the reports, 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

**CRM-M-26090-2019 and
CRM-M-25953-2019**

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 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

**CRM-M-26090-2019 and
CRM-M-25953-2019**

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 also 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, both the petitions are allowed. FIR No.10 dated 24.01.2018, under Sections 324, 323, 336, 506, 427, 148 and 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of the Arms Act, 1959, registered at Police Station Fatehgarh Churian, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur, and DDR No.29 dated 25.01.2018, under Sections 324, 148 and 149 IPC, arising out of the aforesaid FIR, respectively, and all the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise dated 09.03.2019 (Annexure P-3 in both these petitions), subject to depositing the total costs of Rs.20,000/- (Rs.10,000/- in each

**CRM-M-26090-2019 and
CRM-M-25953-2019**

(Regd.), opposite New Public School, Sector-18, Chandigarh.

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

26.02.2020
parveen kumar

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

Note:	Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
	Whether reportable	:	Yes/No