

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

CRM-M -53447-2019

Reserved on 26.11.2021

**Pronounced on:16.12.2021**

Usman Khan @ Mani and others

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA**

Present: Ms. Sukhveer Kaur, Advocate for  
Mr. Anshul Gupta, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. H.S. Sitta, Assistant AG, Punjab.

Mr. Sarvesh Kumar Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*

**ANOOP CHITKARA J.**

| FIR No. | Dated      | Police Station      | Sections               |
|---------|------------|---------------------|------------------------|
| 44      | 22.04.2019 | City-II, Malerkotla | 323, 341, 506 & 34 IPC |

The petitioners, who have been arraigned as accused in the above captioned FIR, have come up before this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR and all consequential proceedings based on the compromise with the victims.

2. The gist of the allegations against the petitioners(s) is that on 22.04.2019, the complainant(respondent No.2) informed the police in the following terms:

He stated that on 21.04.2019 at 11 am, when he was returning to his home Usman Khan @ Mani, Sahil Khan, Danish and Mohd. Usman @ Chobani (present petitioners), armed with iron rod, stopped his scooty and hit his head with the said rods. After that he

fell down and subsequently Mani gave fist blows on his nose and Danish and Sahil also gave kick blows on his head and stomach. He stated that on his shouting, people gathered and they ran away. It is further stated that grudge of the accused is that Subhan along with his friends were routinely misbehaving with his wife and he had objected to the same several times.

3. During the pendency of the petition, the accused and the injured have compromised the matter, and its copy is annexed with this petition. After that, the petitioners have come up before this Court to quash the FIR, and in the quashing petition, the injured have been impleaded as respondent(s).

4. On the prayer of the parties, the Court vide had permitted the parties to appear before the concerned Court to record their statements. As per the concerned Sessions Court's report, the victim(s), without any threat, consented to the quashing of FIR and consequent proceedings.

ANALYSIS & REASONING:

5. As per report of the JMIC, Malerkotla, statements of the parties have been recorded and the compromise effected between them is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion and undue influence.

6. The following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition: -

- a) The accused and the private respondent(s) have amicably settled the matter between them in terms of the compromise deed and the statements recorded before the concerned Court;
- b) A perusal of the documents reveal that the settlement has not been secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means;
- c) The victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings;
- d) There is no objection from the private respondents in case present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed;
- e) In the given facts, the occurrence does not affect public peace or tranquillity, moral turpitude or harm the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy;
- f) The rejection of compromise may also lead to ill will. The pendency of trial affects career and happiness;

- g) There is nothing on the record to prima facie consider the accused as an unscrupulous, habitual, or professional offender;
- h) The purpose of criminal jurisprudence is reformatory in nature and to work to bring peace to family and society;
- i) The ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power by quashing the FIR and the consequent proceedings.

7. In the present case, the offences are compoundable under Section 320 CrPC. Given the legislative mandate, the prosecution can be closed by quashing the FIR and consequent proceedings.

8. In Shakuntala Sawhney v Kaushalya Sawhney, (1979) 3 SCR 639, at P 642, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the finest hour of Justice arises propitiously when parties, who fell apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.

9. In Himachal Pradesh Cricket Association v State of Himachal Pradesh, 2018 (4) Crimes 324, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds "[47]. As far as Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 135 of 2017 is concerned, the appellants came to this Court challenging the order of cognizance only because of the reason that matter was already pending as the appellants had filed the Special Leave Petitions against the order of the High Court rejecting their petition for quashing of the FIR/Chargesheet. Having regard to these peculiar facts, writ petition has also been entertained. In any case, once we hold that FIR needs to be quashed, order of cognizance would automatically stands vitiated."

10. In the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the petition is allowed in the aforementioned terms. The FIR and other proceedings captioned above, with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the present petitioners. The bail bonds of the petition are accordingly discharged. All pending application(s), if any, stand closed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)

JUDGE

16.12.2021

anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No