

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46659-2019

Date of Decision: 24.02.2020

Baljit Singh @ Kala and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAMENDRA JAIN

Present: Mr. Nakul Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Bhupender Beniwal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. MS Sachdev, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

RAMENDRA JAIN, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been made for quashing FIR No. 86 dated 01.09.2011 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 307, 323, 324, 148 and 149 IPC at Police Station Mehatpur, District Jalandhar and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 04.09.2019 (Annexure P-3) effected in between the parties.

Pursuant to orders dated 01.11.2019 of this Court, the parties appeared before the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jalandhar, on 30.11.2019 to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jalandhar submitted his report vide letter No. 17/2020 dated 10.01.2020 duly forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Jalandhar, vide letter No. 151 dated 15.01.2020.

According to the report, learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jalandhar, is satisfied that compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any threat, duress, pressure or coercion.

In the instant case, quashment of FIR No. 86 dated 01.09.2011 (Annexure P-1) under Section 307 IPC, has been sought. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) RCR(Criminal) 482** has held as under: -

“31 (VI) Offences under Section 307 IPC would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore is to be generally treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of Section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of Section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence,

which if proved, would lead to proving the charge under Section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delegate parts of the body, nature of weapons used etc. Medical report in respect of injuries suffered by the victim can generally be the guiding factor. On

the basis of this prima facie analysis, the High Court can examine as to whether there is a strong possibility of conviction or the chances of conviction are remote and bleak. In the former case it can refuse to accept the settlement and quash the criminal proceedings whereas in the later case it would be permissible for the High Court to accept the plea compounding the offence based on complete settlement between the parties. At this stage, the Court can also be swayed by the fact that the settlement between the parties is going to result in harmony between them which may improve their future relationship.”

In **Jagroop Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others** in **CRM-M No.16154 of 2016 decided on 01.03.2017**, a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in para No. 8 of the judgment has observed as under: -

“{8}. In nutshell each case has to be considered on its own merits. While exercising inherent powers, High Court has to examine whether possibility of conviction is bleak and continuation of proceedings would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and would result in futility. Offence under Section 307 IPC falls under the category of heinous offence and generally it is to be treated offence against the State/society and not an individual offence. At the

same time High Court would not base its decision merely because offence under Section 307 IPC is mentioned in the FIR or in the charge. It is still open before the Court as to whether insertion of offence under Section 307 IPC is based on evidence or it is just for the sake of incorporation in the FIR.”

In compliance of order dated 07.02.2020, original receipts regarding deposit of costs of ₹20,000/- have also been produced in Court today. The same are taken on record. Be tagged at appropriate place.

Considering the report of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jalandhar dated 10.01.2020 and deposit of costs as well as the fact that the compromise will bring peace and harmony between the parties, aforesaid FIR No. 86 dated 01.09.2011 (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed, qua the petitioners only.

Registry is directed to verify deposit of aforesaid costs, with the concerned quarter.

Disposed of, accordingly

February 24, 2020
rishu

(RAMENDRA JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No