

212 (2 cases)

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

Date of Decision: 11.02.2021

1. CRM-M-36888-2020

Balwinder Singh @ Binda and another

Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

Respondents

2. CRM-M-37207-2020

Jasbir Singh and others

Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AVNEESH JHINGAN

Present: Mr. Lupil Gutpa, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M-36888-2020 and
for the respondent No.2 in CRM-M-372027-2020.

Mr. Arun Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M-37207-2020 and
for the respondents No.2 and 3 in CRM-M-36888-2020.

Ms. Samina Dhir, D.A.G., Punjab.

AVNEESH JHINGAN, J (Oral):

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

Two petitions have been filed for quashing of cross cases. CRM-M-36888 of 2020 for quashing of FIR No. 147, dated

02.08.2020, under Sections 326, 452, 506, 148 and 149 IPC, registered at Police Station Bhikhiwind, District Tarn Taran. CRM-M-37207-2020 is filed for quashing of *Rapat* No. 30, dated 04.08.2020, under Sections 326, 452, 427 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Bhikhiwind, District Tarn Taran.

The cross cases were got registered by members of same family. The dispute was with regard to land. With the intervention of the respectables and elders of the family, the matter was compromised vide compromise deed dated 25th August, 2020.

The parties approached this Court for quashing of FIR and *Rapat*. On 10th November, 2020, the parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/ trial Court for getting their statements recorded.

The report dated 7th January, 2021 is received to the effect that compromise is genuine, without any undue influence; the parties are not involved in any other criminal case and the challan has not been presented till date.

The Supreme Court in case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another 2012 (4) RCR (Crl.) 543**, has held as under:-

“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.”

(emphasis supplied)

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.”

(emphasis supplied)

The parties are members of the same family and are closely related. They have resolved their differences and decided to live peacefully. To meet the ends of justice and considering that continuation of trial will only hamper the efforts of the parties to give themselves another chance to live peacefully, the petitions are allowed. The above mentioned FIR and *Rapat* with all consequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

A photocopy of this order be placed in the file of connected petition.

[AVNEESH JHINGAN]
JUDGE

11th February, 2021

pankaj baweja

1. Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes
2. Whether reportable	:	Yes