

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

**CRM-M-27687-2020(O&M)**

**Date of decision : 21.01.2021**

Chetan Rana and others

... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Punjab and another

... Respondent(s)

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

Present:- Mr. Hoshiar Singh Jaswal, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

Mr. Ram Kumar Chauhan, Advocate for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

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

Heard through video conferencing.

The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of cross case bearing DDR No.40 dated 11.06.2019 under Sections 341, 323, 149, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur in case FIR No.53 dated 11.06.2019 registered under Sections 452/354/323/149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur as well as all other consequential proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 07.03.2020 (Annexure P-3).

Vide order dated 28.10.2020 the parties were directed to appear before the concerned Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate/Trial Court for recording of their statements.

Report dated 08.12.2020 from the Judicial Magistrate, First

Class, Hoshiarpur has since been received wherein it has been stated that all the accused and the complainant have got their statements recorded and as per the report, the compromise entered into between the parties is genuine and voluntary and without any threat, pressure or coercion. None of the accused, in the present case, have been declared as proclaimed offender.

The present case is a of cross versions and the parties had appeared before the Judicial Magistrate First Class for recording of their statements, which have since been recorded and it has been reported that the parties have since compromised the matter without any 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-dominatingly 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 CrPC 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 Trial Court 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, DDR No.40 dated 11.06.2019 under Sections 341, 323, 149, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur in case FIR No.53 dated 11.06.2019 registered under Sections 452/354/323/149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Chabbewal, District Hoshiarpur as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising there-from, stand quashed.

The petition is accordingly allowed.

( ALKA SARIN )  
JUDGE

21.01.2021  
Yogesh Sharma

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