

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

283

CRM-M-935-2022
Date of decision: 01.08.2022

MANDEEP SINGH @ MANNU

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD S. BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Abhayjeet Singh, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Chetan Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Arun Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

VINOD S. BHARDWAJ. J.(Oral)

1. By means of the instant petition, the jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter referred to as "Cr.P.C.") has been invoked for seeking quashing of FIR No. 296 dated 14.06.2012 under Sections 148/149/323/341/427 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter referred to as "IPC") registered at Police Station City Thanesar, Kurukshetra, District Kurukshetra, Haryana (Annexure P-1) and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 06.12.2021 (Annexure P-2) entered between the parties.

2. The parties were directed to appear before the learned trial

Court/Illaq Magistrate vide order dated 20.04.2022 of this Court, to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise arrived at between the parties and a report in this regard was called for.

3. Pursuant to the order dated 20.04.2022, the petitioner has already deposited a cost of Rs. 50,000/- with the "Poor Patient Welfare Fund" (PGIMER), Chandigarh. The parties had also appeared before the trial Court and got their statements recorded and in this regard report has been received from the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kurukshetra vide Memo No. 754 dated 30.05.2022. The relevant extract of the report is reproduced as under:-

"I have also personally satisfied myself that the FIR was lodged by the complainant against accused persons including accused Mandeep Singh @ Mannu and now the complainant and accused Mandeep Singh @ Mannu have arrived at a compromise without any coercion, undue influence or pressure and the compromise as arrived between them is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion and the complainant has no objection in case the present FIR against the accused is quashed. As per statement of the complainant as well as another victim, the compromise with respect to other accused persons had already been entered into. It is further submitted that as per the record of the judicial case file and the statement of parties, the FIR inquestion was registered against five accused persons namely Mandeep Singh @Mannu, Pankaj Sapra, Rahul Kadiyan, Narender Rana and Deepak Kumar. The other accused persons except for accused Mandeep Singh @ Mannu, who had been declared as proclaimed person v.o.d. 10.08.2015, had already been acquitted vide judgment dated 11.03.2016 passed by the then Id. JMJC, Kurukshetra. The judicial case file had been consigned to

the record room with the noting that it not be destroyed and be restored as and when accused Mandeep Singh @ Mannu appears or is produced before the court. Further, it is submitted that as per statement of the complainant, the compromise has been effected with all the accused persons and with him as well as another victim, who is his son Vaibhav Arora and his statement with respect to compromise has also been recorded as referred above.”

4. Learned State counsel does not dispute the factum of the compromise amongst the parties and does not have any serious objection to the resolution of the dispute amongst the parties.

5. Mr. Arun Gupta, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent No. 2 and reiterates the settlement and his concurrence to the FIR and all the other consequential proceedings being quashed.

6. The Full Bench of this Court in the matter of “***Kulwinder Singh and others versus State of Punjab and another***” reported as ***(Punjab and Haryana High Court) : 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*** has been observed as under :

'(28) To conclude, it can safely be said that there can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the Court to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. The only principle that can be laid down is the one which has been incorporated in the Section itself, i.e., "to prevent abuse of the process of any Court" or "to secure the ends of justice".

*(29) In **Mrs. Shakuntala Sawhney v. Mrs. Kaushalya Sawhney and Ors.**, Hon'ble Krishna Iyer, J. aptly summoned up the essence of compromise in the following words:*

“The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship of reunion.”

(30) The power to do complete justice is the very essence of every judicial justice dispensation system. It cannot be diluted by distorted perceptions and is not a slave to anything, except to the caution and circumspection, the standards of which the Court sets before it, in exercise of such plenary and unfettered power inherently vested in it while donning the cloak of compassion to achieve the ends of justice.

(31) No embargo, be in the shape of Section 320(9) of the Cr.P.C., or any other such curtailment, can whittle down the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C.

(32) The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour. It is the soul of justice and if the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is used to enhance such a compromise which, in turn, enhances the social amity and reduces friction, then it truly is "finest hour of justice". Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters, commercial transactions and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. in the event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases. There can never be any such rigid rule to prescribe the exercise of such power, especially in the absence of any premonitions to forecast and predict eventualities which the cause of justice may throw up during the course of a litigation.

(33) The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under

Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

(34) The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined para-meters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever-lasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.

7. The legal principles as laid down for quashing of the judgment were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **'Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another,(2012)10 SCC303'**. Still further, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **'Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others versus State of Gujarat and another" (2017) 9 SCC 641'**.

8. It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be a waste of judicial time and there appears to be no chances of conviction.

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in the matter of **'Ramgopal And Another Vs State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC Online SC 834'**, that the matters which can be categorized as personal in nature or in the matter in which the nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or commission of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of which would override public interest, the Court can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties. The observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is extracted as under:-

19. We thus sum-up and hold that as opposed to Section 320 Cr.P.C. where the Court is squarely guided by the compromise between the parties in respect of offences 'compoundable' within the statutory framework, the extraordinary power enjoined upon a High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. or vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution, can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of Section 320 Cr.P.C. Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings, bearing in mind: (i) Nature and effect of the offence on the conscious of the society; (ii) Seriousness of the injury, if any; (iii) Voluntary nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; & (iv) Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations.

10. The following relevant factors emerge from perusal of the case as well as the subsequent developments supplementing a case for invocation of the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.:-

- i) The dispute is arising from a scuffle between the parties resulting in injuries being caused to the complainant. The injuries caused are simple in nature.
- ii) The co-accused persons namely Pankaj, Rahul, Narender and Deepak were acquitted vide judgment dated 11.03.2016 passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Kurukshetra.
- iii) The petitioner was declared as proclaimed offender vide order dated 10.08.2015. The petitioner has deposited Rs. 50,000/- with the Poor Patients Welfare Fund at PGIMER, Chandigarh as costs as directed by this Court vide order dated 20.04.2022.
- iv) The petitioner is 34 years of age and continuation of criminal proceedings will cause severe repercussions to the petitioner in discharge of their obligations as well as in his work place.
- v) The FIR was registered in the year 2012 and the trial qua the petitioner is yet to commence.
- vi) The offence in question cannot be said to be heinous or as an offence that would be shocking to the conscience of the society or public at large. It can also not be termed as one shocking to the conscience of the Court;
- vii) Continuation of the proceedings and forcing the parties to undergo rigours of criminal proceedings is not likely to subserve any large public interest;

- viii) The proceedings are likely to end in futility for want of parties to support the case of the prosecution;
- ix) No larger public purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings;
- x) The complainant is not likely to support the case of the prosecution. Continuation of the proceedings is likely to be a waste of judicial time. The object of law is well served when the parties resolve their differences and choose to peacefully co-exist and live in harmony.
11. In view of the report of the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Kurukshetra and the principles laid down by the Apex Court in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others (2012) 10 SCC 303**, as well as **Ramgopal And Another Vs State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC Online SC 834** and also by the Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, the instant petition is allowed. The aforesaid FIR No. 296 dated 14.06.2012 under Sections 148/149/323/341/427 and 506 of the IPC registered at Police Station City Thanesar, District Kurukshetra Haryana (Annexure P-1) and all other consequential proceedings arising there from **are hereby quashed** qua the petitioner in view of compromise/affidavit dated 06.12.2021 (Annexure P-2).

Petition is allowed.

(VINOD S. BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

AUGUST 01, 2022

Vishal Sharma

Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	:	Yes/No