

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

CRM-M-54037-2018 (O&M)

Date of decision:08.09.2021

Rajiv Gupta

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana

.....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. S.K. Garg Narwana, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Arav Gupta, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Deepak Sabherwal, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. N.S. Shekhawat, Senior Advocate with
Mr. Sahil Gupta, Advocate for complainant.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.518 dated 10.09.2017 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Yamunanagar City, District Yamunanagar, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

On the oral request of learned senior counsel for the petitioner, with no objection from learned State counsel and learned senior counsel for the complainant, Shashi Garg son of Shyam Lal Garg, resident of Punjab Plywood Industry, Khazoori Road, Yamunanagar, Haryana, is impleaded as respondent No.2.

Registry is directed to make necessary correction in the memo of parties accordingly.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits that a compromise has been effected between the parties. He has placed on record

the agreement/memorandum of understanding dated 06.09.2021, which is taken on record as mark 'C'.

Learned State counsel and learned senior counsel for the complainant do not dispute the factum of the compromise.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

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.

The 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 predominatingly 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, the petition is allowed. FIR No.518 dated 10.09.2017 registered under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471, 506 and 120-B IPC at Police Station Yamunanagar City, District Yamunanagar, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed qua the petitioner.

Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms of the compromise.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

08.09.2021

Ishwar

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No