

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

239 (2)

**CRM-M-24966-2021
Date of Decision: 23.09.2021**

Vikrant Sharma and another

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE LALIT BATRA

Present: Mr. Karanjit Singh, Advocate
for petitioners.

Mr. Mehardeep Singh, Additional Advocate General,
Punjab for respondent No.1.

Mr. Gaurav Sharma, Advocate for respondents No.2 and 3.

Lalit Batra, J.(Oral)

Case has been taken up for hearing through Video Conferencing.

This petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of Cross-Version registered vide DDR No.45 dated 10.01.2016 under Sections 148, 307, 323, 341, 379-B IPC read with Section 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act (vide DDR No.45 dated 10.01.2020 offences under Sections 148, 307 and 379-B IPC read with Section 149 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act were deleted and Section 34 of IPC was added) in FIR No.11 dated 10.01.2016 under Sections 148, 307, 341, 323 IPC read with Section 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar City and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 23.06.2021 (Annexure P/2) arrived at between petitioners and respondents No.2 and 3.

Learned counsel for the parties have stated that the present FIR may be quashed as the parties have amicably settled the dispute.

During the course of preliminary hearing, the trial Court was directed to record the statements of all the concerned parties, with regard to the genuineness and validity or otherwise of the compromise by this Court.

In compliance thereof, report dated 17.09.2021 from Judicial Magistrate First Class, Amritsar, through District and Sessions Judge, Amritsar has been received with statements of parties, in which, it has been mentioned that the compromise is genuine and there was no undue influence or coercion from any side.

A bare perusal of aforesaid report reveals that petitioners have been arrayed as accused in the instant case for the commission of the offence under Sections 323 and 341 IPC read with Section 34 IPC.

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 proceedings of the appeal against conviction pending in Sessions Court and in case of involving non-compoundable offence.

An identical question came to be decided by Hon'ble Supreme Court in case **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another, 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543**. Having interpreted the

relevant provisions, it was ruled 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 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 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.”

The same view has been reiterated by the Apex Court in case **Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another,** 2014(2) RCR (Criminal) 482.

Having regard to the contentions of learned counsel for the parties and the fact that both the parties to the litigation have entered into compromise and on that basis, the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed for quashing the present FIR. The compromise has been arrived at with the intervention of the respectables and family members and the parties have decided to keep harmony between them and to live peacefully in future. Hence, it would be in the interest of justice that parties are allowed to compromise the matter particularly when offence under Sections 148, 307 and 379-B IPC read with Section 149 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act were deleted and Section 34 of IPC was added. Moreover, learned counsel for the parties are *ad idem* that, in view of the settlement of disputes between the parties, the present petition deserves to be accepted in this context.

In view of above, the instant petition is accepted.

Consequently, the impugned Cross Case registered vide DDR No.45

dated 10.01.2016 under Sections 148, 307, 323, 341, 379-B IPC read with Section 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act (vide DDR No.45 dated 10.01.2020 offences under Sections 148, 307 and 379-B IPC read with Section 149 IPC and Section 25 of Arms Act were deleted and Section 34 of IPC was added) in FIR No.11 dated 10.01.2016 under Sections 148, 307, 341, 323 IPC read with Section 149 IPC and Sections 25 and 27 of Arms Act, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, District Amritsar City (*Challan* presented under Sections 323 and 341 IPC read with Section 34 IPC) and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed, on the basis of compromise, qua petitioners only.

(LALIT BATRA)
JUDGE

23.09.2021

'vishal'

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/ No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/ No