

201-A

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

**CRM-M NO.4493 of 2021
DECIDED ON: 5th APRIL, 2021**

Lakhwinder Singh and others

.....PETITIONERS

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN.

Present: Mr. Ranjit Saini, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Deepak Bhardwaj, D.A.G., Haryana.

Ms. Monika Thakur, Advocate
for respondent No.2-complainant.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (ORAL)

The matter is taken up for hearing through video conference due to COVID-19 situation.

This is a petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of FIR No.20 dated 05.02.2018 registered under Sections 323, 506, 147, 149, 404, 467, 468, 471, 420 and 120-B of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Radaur, District Yamunanagar, on the basis of compromise.

The FIR was registered at the behest of complainant-respondent No.2, namely, Ram Singh against six of his relatives. The dispute was with regard to the registered 'Will' dated 21.05.2014 executed by his

grandmother. The allegations levelled in the complaint were that the complainant was being harassed to transfer the entire property. During investigation, four more persons were found involved. During the pendency, one of the accused, namely, Kuldeep Singh died.

The present petition has been filed for quashing of said FIR on the basis of compromise dated 21.12.2020. Vide order dated 16.02.2021, the parties were directed to get their statements recorded before the trial Court.

Report dated 05.03.2021 of the District and Sessions Judge, Yamuna Nagar has been received, wherein, it is stated that the compromise effected into between the parties is genuine and entered into by their free will. There is only one victim.

Learned counsel for the complainant/respondent No.2 has no objection in quashing of the FIR.

Total ten accused were there. The petitioners and the complainant are the relatives. The dispute was with regard to inheritance of the property. The good sense has prevailed over the parties. They have bridged the ridge and decided to live peacefully saving their relations to an extent possible.

Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, has held:-

“The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the

Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined para-meters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever-lasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.”

The Supreme Court in ***Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another, 2017 AIR (SC) 4843*** has expounded principles governing the exercise of powers under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. The relevant portion is reproduced as under:-

“15. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions :

(i) Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court;

(ii) The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a First Information Report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

(iii) In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power;

(iv) While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court;

(v) The decision as to whether a complaint or First Information Report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated;

(vi) In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences;

(vii) As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing in so far as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned;

(viii) Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute;

(ix) In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

(x) There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions (viii) and (ix) above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the state have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”

-

All the nine surviving accused are the petitioners in the present petition. The parties are in relation and a compromise has been arrived into amongst them. The controversy between the parties arose due to registered 'Will' and the inheritance of the property. Since the matter has been compromised between the parties, no useful purpose would be served by

continuing with the trial. To meet the ends of justice, the present petition is allowed and the FIR as mentioned above along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

5th APRIL, 2021

gurpreet

**(AVNEESH JHINGAN)
JUDGE**

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>