

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

256

CRM-M-7861-2022
Decided on : 07.04.2022

Bhajan Singh

. . . Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Monty Goyal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. G. S. Sandhu, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 49 dated 21.04.2019 under Sections 323, 379-B and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Section 3(1)(x) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Amendment 2015) registered at Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising on the basis of the compromise.

When the matter came up before this Court on 24.02.2022, the following order was passed:-

“This is a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.49 dated 21.04.2019 registered under Sections 323, 379-B, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and

Section 3(1)(x) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Amendment 2015) at Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that all the persons concerned are party to the compromise.

Notice of motion for 07.04.2022.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. G.S. Sandhu, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent No.2.

The parties are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements qua compromise within a period of three weeks.

The Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court is directed to submit a report on or before the next date of hearing containing the following information:-

- 1. Number of persons arrayed as accused.*
- 2. Whether any accused is proclaimed offender?*
- 3. Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence?*
- 4. Whether the accused persons are involved in any other FIR or not?*
- 5. The trial Court is also directed to record the statement of the Investigating Officer as to how many victims/complainants are there in the FIR. ”*

In pursuance of the said order, a report has been submitted by the Judge Special Court, Sri Muktsar Sahib to the Registrar (General) of this Court. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced

hereinbelow:-

“5. It is submitted that in view of aforesaid order, the statements of the parties have been recorded. From the statement of the complainant and accused it is inferred that compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. Further, from the statement of IO, it comes out that there is only one accused namely Bhajan Singh and only one victim/complainant Adesh Kumar and from the statement of IO as well as from the statement of accused, it comes out that accused is not declared proclaimed offender in any case. However, there are some more cases stands registered against the accused, which have been disclosed by the accused in his statement and list in that regard has also been produced as Ex.C1 by the Investigating Officer.

Submitted, please.

A perusal of the said report would show that it has been stated that the statements of the complainant as well as the petitioner have been recorded in the case and both have stated that the matter has been compromised and they have no objection in case the FIR is quashed. It is further stated that the statement of the complainant has been made voluntarily without any fear, coercion or pressure. The fact that the petitioner is involved in some other cases also, would not come in way of quashing of the present FIR on the basis of the compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was never declared proclaimed offender in the present case

and is not involved in any other case.

Learned counsel for the State, as per instructions, has stated that these facts are correct.

Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 has reiterated the factum of compromise and has prayed for quashing of FIR on the basis of the same.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the file. After perusing the report submitted by the trial Court, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioner and the complainant. Since the matter has been settled and the parties have decided to live in peace, this Court feels that in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings deserve to be quashed.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***“Kulwinder Singh and others Vs State of Punjab”, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***, it is held that High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution where the High Court is of the opinion that the same is required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of ***“Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another”, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543***, had also

observed that in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court, inherent power can be used by this Court to quash criminal proceedings in which a compromise has been effected. The relevant portion of para 57 of the said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“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. XXX---XXX”

In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 49 dated 21.04.2019 under Sections 323, 379-B and 506 of the Indian Penal Code,1860, Section 25 of the Arms Act, 1959 and Section 3(1)(x) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (Amendment 2015) registered at Police Station Kabarwala, District Sri Muktsar Sahib (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising on the basis of the compromise, are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioner.

April 7th, 2022
Mehak

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No