

211

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

CRM-M No. 28661 of 2020
Date of Decision: 17.11.2020

Rakesh Saini and others

-Petitioners

Vs

State of Haryana and another

-Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJ MOHAN SINGH

Present: Mr. Neeraj Yadav, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Rajat Gautam, D.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Prashant Singh, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

RAJ MOHAN SINGH, J. (ORAL)

The case has been taken up for hearing through video-conferencing.

[1]. Petitioners have preferred this petition for quashing of FIR No.122 dated 30.06.2020 registered under Sections 323, 34, 354-A, 452, 506 IPC at Police Station Rampura, Rewari (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising in pursuance thereof on the basis of compromise.

[2]. Vide order dated 21.09.2020, both the parties were directed to appear before the concerned Court and make statements in respect of veracity of compromise in question.

The Court was also directed to give its report on different parameters.

[3]. In pursuance to the aforesaid order, both the parties have appeared in person before the concerned Court and have deposed in the context of genuineness of compromise in question. Both the parties were identified by their respective counsels namely Mr. Pawan Kumar Yadav, Advocate for the complainant and Mr. Sube Singh Yadav, Advocate for the accused.

[4]. The Court has also recorded its satisfaction in respect of genuineness of compromise in question. The compromise is found to be voluntarily executed between the parties. No accused has not been declared as proclaimed offender. No other person has been found to be involved except the accused who have been arrayed as petitioners in the present petition.

[5]. The disposal of present case on the basis of compromise duly satisfies the parameters given in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543.**

[6]. This Court is of the opinion that offence is private in nature and not against the whole society. In **Gian Singh's case** (*supra*), the Hon'ble Supreme Court has discussed in detail the inherent powers of the High Court in quashing criminal

proceedings or FIR or complaint where the parties have entered into compromise except the cases which involve offences such as murder, rape, dacoity etc., as such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on the society.

[7]. This Court is of the opinion that in view of compromise between the parties, chances of conviction of the accused are remote and there is minimal chance of the witnesses coming forward to depose in support of prosecution version. In view of remote chances of conviction, it would be appropriate to exercise discretionary power of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to put an end to the controversy for all times to come. The compromise would facilitate both the parties to live in peace and to maintain public tranquility and offence in question is personal in nature and does not involve any heinous and serious offence of any mental depravity, nor it involves any offence covered under Prevention of Corruption Act. Therefore, when possibility of conviction is remote and bleak, continuation of criminal proceedings would put the accused to oppression and prejudice. In such a situation the exercise of power to quash the proceedings would be in consonance with the provisions of law to meet ends of justice and to prevent unnecessary continuation of proceedings which may ultimately result in some unnecessary vagaries of criminal trial.

[8]. The State on notice, however, object to the aforesaid course, but in order to prevent unnecessary continuation of criminal proceedings on the ground that there are bleak chances of conviction in the case, this Court is of the opinion that it would be just expedient and in fitness of things to quash the proceedings on the basis of compromise.

[9]. For the reasons recorded hereinabove, I deem it appropriate to quash the FIR No.122 dated 30.06.2020 registered under Sections 323, 34, 354-A, 452, 506 IPC at Police Station Rampura, Rewari (Annexure P-1) along with subsequent proceedings arisen thereof (if any), are hereby quashed.

[10]. Petition stands disposed of.

17.11.2020
Jyoti Sharma

(RAJ MOHAN SINGH)
JUDGE

- | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|---|--------|
| 1. | Whether speaking/reasoned | : | Yes/No |
| 2. | Whether reportable | : | Yes/No |