

CRM-M-45616-2019

Date of decision : February 17, 2020

Lovepreet Singh @ Love and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN

Present:- Mr. A.S. Manaise, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Manish Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.2.

ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN, J. (Oral)

By way of the present petition, filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No. 91 dated 22.6.2015 under Sections 379, 341, 506, 427, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Batala, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties.

Vide order dated 24.10.2019, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court and the trial Court was directed to record the statements of the parties and submit a report regarding the authenticity of the compromise reached and the fact that it has been arrived at without any kind of undue influence or pressure, and would thereafter send its report to this Court, before the next date of hearing. The trial Court was further directed to verify whether there is any other person involved in the occurrence, who is not a party to the present petition and whose consent for the compromise would be required, if this

Court comes to the conclusion that the FIR sought to be quashed can be quashed.

Report dated 18.11.2019 has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Batala, wherein it has been reported that statements of the parties have been recorded. The trial Court further submitted that there are three accused and no other criminal case is pending against them. The trial Court is satisfied that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine and is not the result of any pressure or coercion.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that there is no other case pending between the parties and the accused has not been declared a proclaimed offenders.

Learned State counsel, on instructions from the Investigating Officer, has not disputed the fact that the parties have arrived at a settlement with an intent to give burial to their differences.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, it is held that the High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution where the High Court feel that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

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

under:-

"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 personal 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."

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.

In view of the above discussion, present petition is allowed and FIR No.91 dated 22.6.2015 under Sections 379, 341, 506, 427, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Civil Lines Batala, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur and all the subsequent proceedings, arising therefrom are ordered to be quashed, subject to deposit of costs of Rs.5,000/- with the State Legal Services Authority, Gurdaspur.

February 17, 2020
satish

(ARVIND SINGH SANGWAN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No