

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

**CRM-M-29677-2020(O&M)**

**Date of decision : 21.01.2021**

Rupinder Singh @ Kaka and others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondent(s)

**CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN**

Present: Mr. B.S. Jaswal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. V.G. Jauhar, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jagjot Singh Lalli, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 & 3.

\*\*\*\*

**ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)**

Heard through video conferencing.

On 12.10.2020, the following order was passed:-

*“Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No. 122 dated 16.07.2018, under Sections 323, 325, 34 IPC, registered at Police Station Gobindgarh Mandi, District Fatehgarh Sahib and all proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise which as per counsel has been entered into between the parties.*

*Counsel submits that even though the challan stands presented but the trial is yet to commence. With the intervention of the elders a compromise has been thrashed out and under such circumstances it would be an abuse of the process of law if criminal prosecution based on the impugned FIR were to continue.*

*Notice of motion returnable for 20.01.2021.*

*Mr. A.S.Sandhu, learned Addl. AG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of the State of Punjab/respondent No.1.*

*Mr. J.S.Lalli, Advocate has entered appearance on behalf of complainant party/respondents No.2 and 3 and concedes to the factum of a compromise.*

*In the meanwhile parties are directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording of their statements in support of the compromise.*

*Report in such regard be furnished on or before the adjourned date.”*

Statements of the parties have since been recorded and the report dated 02.11.2020 has been received from Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Amloh wherein it has been stated that the parties have got their statements recorded and that the parties have compromised the matter with the intervention of respectables without any undue influence, pressure or coercion.

In the present case, all the accused i.e. petitioner Nos.1 to 4 and the complainant as well as the injured have entered into a compromise and their statements have since been recorded. All the parties involved have stated that the compromise has been entered into without undue influence or coercion.

The Apex Court in the case of “Gian Singh V/s State of Punjab & Anr.” 2012 (10) SCC 303, has held 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 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 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.”*

Learned counsel for the petitioner has also referred to the law laid down by this Court in “**Kulwinder Singh &Ors. Vs. State of Punjab &Anr.**” 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, wherein it has been held that even in non-compoundable offences, if the parties have entered into a compromise, this Court has wide powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 to quash the proceedings to prevent abuse of law and secure the ends of justice.

In view of the above and keeping in view the report by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Amloh that the parties have genuinely entered into a compromise and all the disputes between the parties have been resolved, it would not be in the interest of justice to continue the criminal proceedings.

Resultantly, FIR No.122 dated 16.07.2018 under Sections 323, 325, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Gobindgarh Mandi, District Fatehgarh Sahib as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising there-from, stand quashed.

The petition is accordingly allowed.

21.01.2021  
Yogesh Sharma

( ALKA SARIN )  
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking  
Whether reportable: YES/NO