

In the High Court of Punjab and Haryana at Chandigarh

**CRM-M No. 5230 of 2017
Date of Decision: 28.7.2021**

Jagdev Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present: Mr. Rajesh Bhateja, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Avtar Singh Sandhu, Addl. A.G., Punjab.

Mr. I.S.Dhaliwal, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

Case is taken up for hearing through video conferencing.

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 20 dated 31.8.2013 registered under Sections 448, 380, 506, 120-B IPC, Police Station NRI Moga, District Moga (Annexure P-1) and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 7.1.2017 (Annexure P-5) arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is a dispute within the family and the FIR in question was got registered by respondent No. 2, who is the son of petitioner No. 1.

Vide order dated 06.3.2019, the trial Court was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the genuineness and validity of the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Moga

has submitted a consolidated report vide letter dated 22.5.2019 which indicates that the parties appeared before the Magistrate and got recorded their respective statements with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the report, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and valid. It has also been submitted in the report that petitioner No. 4-Gurjinder Singh was declared a proclaimed offender on 08.4.2016.

At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No. 4-Gurjinder Singh has been granted pre-arrest bail and produced the order dated 22.5.2019 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Moga, which is taken on record as Mark-'A'.

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.

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another. 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543*** 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 personnel 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 Hon'ble the Apex Court in case ***Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) RCR (Criminal) 482.***

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.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No. 20 dated 31.8.2013 registered under Sections 448, 380, 506, 120-B IPC, Police Station NRI Moga, District Moga (Annexure P-1) and all the consequential proceedings, arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise dated 7.1.2017 (Annexure P-5) subject to their depositing costs of Rs. 10,000/- with the Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh.

Needless to say that parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements made in the Court below.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

July 28, 2021
Gurpreet

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No