

CRM-M No. 10416 of 2022  
Reserved on: 29.03.2022  
Pronounced on: 31.03.2022

Baldev Singh and others through SPA.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and another.....Respondents

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

Present: Mr. Avinash Mandla, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Jaspreet Kaur, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

\*\*\*

**ANOOP CHITKARA J.**

| FIR No. | Dated      | Police Station                          | Sections              |
|---------|------------|-----------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| 141     | 26.05.2017 | Sultanpur Lodhi, District<br>Kapurthala | 323, 341, 452, 34 IPC |

The petitioner(s), arraigned as accused in the above captioned FIR, has come up before this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C for quashing of the FIR and all consequential proceedings based on the compromise with the victim(s).

2. During the pendency of the petition, the accused and the victim(s) have compromised the matter, and its copy is annexed with this petition.
3. After that, the petitioner(s) came up before this Court to quash the FIR, and in the quashing petition, the victim(s) have been impleaded as respondent(s).
4. On 22.03.2022, the victim/ aggrieved person Jasbir Kaur (R-2) stated before the SDJM Sultanpur Lodhi that there would be no objection if the court quashes this FIR and consequent proceedings. As per the concerned court's report dated 25.03.2022, the parties consented to the quashing of FIR and consequent proceedings without any threat. However, Ld. SDJM, also brought to the notice of this court the following facts,  

“(i) In the light of statements suffered by both the parties, it appears that parties have effected compromise which is genuine, voluntary and out of free will and is not the result of any threat, pressure or undue influence etc. in any manner.

(ii) *It is submitted that two persons namely Baldev Singh son of Munsha Singh and Tirath Singh son of Baldev Singh, both residents of Village Jainpur, Tehsil Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala, presently residing BLK-4, Lot-16, Domingo statement, San Antonio Heights, Phase-5, STO Tomas Batangas, Philippines, have been arrayed as accused in the present FIR.*

*It is relevant to mention here that at the time of presentation of report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. before the Court, investigating agency had kept petitioner/accused Tirath Singh son of Baldev Singh in Column No. II.*

*It is further relevant to mention here that when the case was fixed for prosecution evidence under Section 299 Cr.P.C., complainant through Learned APP for the State moved application under Section 319 Cr.P.C for summoning accused Tirath Singh, Sandeep Kaur and Ranjit Kaur as additional accused in the present case. The said application was allowed vide order dated 04.07.2019 passed by my learned Predecessor and petitioner/accused Tirath Singh, Sandeep Kaur and Ranjit Kaur were summoned as additional accused in the present case.*

(iii) *Petitioner/accused Baldev Singh son of Munsha Singh was declared as proclaimed person in the present case vide order dated 06.11.2018 passed by my learned Predecessor, however, petitioners/accused Tirath Singh, Sandeep Kaur and Ranjit Kaur (summoned under Section 319 Cr.P.C.) did not turn up in the Court despite being issuance of summons upon them.*

*It is important to mention here that earlier also petitioners/accused Baldev Singh son of Munsha Singh and Tirath Singh son of Baldev Singh, both residents of village Jainpur, P.S. Sultanpur Lodhi, Kapurthala preferred quashing petition bearing CRM-M-48330 of 2019 before the Hon'ble High Court in which Hon'ble High Court vide order dated 14.11.2019 directed petitioner/accused Baldev Singh son of Munsha Singh to surrender before the trial Court within 10 days and on such surrender, petitioner Baldev Singh shall be released on interim bail by the trial Court on furnishing of bail bonds by him to its satisfaction. In pursuance of aforesaid direction, petitioner/accused Baldev Singh did not surrender before this Court rather filed present quashing petition through attorney Gurdeep Singh son of Munsha Singh, by concealing the fact with regard to filing of earlier petition before the Hon'ble High Court, which is already pending before the Hon'ble High Court for 09.09.2022.*

#### ANALYSIS & REASONING:

5. Despite the severe opposition of the State's counsel to this compromise, the following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition.

6. Although the petitioners did not surrender mentioned before, yet to enter into compromise is a separate statutory right vested under section 320 Cr.P.C and as extended to non-compoundable cases by various judicial pronouncements. There is no doubt that the petitioners evaded trial and their presence in the court, but simultaneously even the State agencies failed to apprehend them. This court is not adjudicating the prima facie unfair and evasive behaviour of the accused, but is dealing with a petition for quashing of FIR based on compromise arrived at between the accused and the aggrieved persons. Now, 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. Thus in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case alone, there is no reason or justification to dismiss the present petition, which is based on the compromise.

- a) A perusal of the documents reveal that the settlement has not been secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means;
- b) The victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings;
- c) There is no objection from the private respondents in case present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed;
- d) 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;
- e) The rejection of compromise may also lead to ill will. The pendency of trial affects career and happiness;
- f) There is nothing on the record to prima facie consider the accused as an unscrupulous, incorrigible, or professional offender;
- g) The purpose of criminal jurisprudence is reformatory in nature and to work to bring peace to family, community, and society;
- h) The exercise of the inherent power for quashing the FIR and all consequential proceedings is justified to secure the ends of justice.

6. In the present case, the offences under section 452 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, (IPC) is not compoundable under Section 320 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Cr.P.C). However, in the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the prosecution qua the non-compoundable offences can be closed by quashing the FIR and consequent proceedings.

7. In Shiji @ Pappu v. Radhika, (2011) 10 SCC 705, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds, [13]. It is manifest that simply because an offence is not compoundable under Section 320 Indian Penal Code is by itself no reason for the High Court to refuse exercise of its power under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code That power can in our opinion be exercised in cases where there is no chance of recording a

conviction against the accused and the entire exercise of a trial is destined to be an exercise in futility. There is a subtle distinction between compounding of offences by the parties before the trial Court or in appeal on one hand and the exercise of power by the High Court to quash the prosecution under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code on the other. While a Court trying an accused or hearing an appeal against conviction, may not be competent to permit compounding of an offence based on a settlement arrived at between the parties in cases where the offences are not compoundable under Section 320, the High Court may quash the prosecution even in cases where the offences with which the accused stand charged are non-compoundable. The inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code are not for that purpose controlled by Section 320 Criminal Procedure Code. Having said so, we must hasten to add that the plenitude of the power under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code by itself, makes it obligatory for the High Court to exercise the same with utmost care and caution. The width and the nature of the power itself demands that its exercise is sparing and only in cases where the High Court is, for reasons to be recorded, of the clear view that continuance of the prosecution would be nothing but an abuse of the process of law. It is neither necessary nor proper for us to enumerate the situations in which the exercise of power under Section 482 may be justified. All that we need to say is that the exercise of power must be for securing the ends of justice and only in cases where refusal to exercise that power may result in the abuse of the process of law. The High court may be justified in declining interference if it is called upon to appreciate evidence for it cannot assume the role of an appellate court while dealing with a petition under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code. Subject to the above, the High Court will have to consider the facts and circumstances of each case to determine whether it is a fit case in which the inherent powers may be invoked.

8. In Parbatbhai Aahir v State of Gujarat, (2017) 9 SCC 641, a three Judges Bench of Hon'ble Supreme Court, laid down the broad principles for quashing of FIR, which are reproduced as follows: -

[16]. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarized in the following propositions:

16 (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;

16 (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.

16 (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;

16 (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;

16 (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;

16 (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;

16 (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;

16 (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;

16 (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

16 (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.

9. In Ramgopal v. The State of Madhya Pradesh, *Cr.A 1489 of 2012*, decided on 29.09.2021, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds,

[11]. True it is that offences which are 'non-compoundable' cannot be compounded by a criminal court in purported exercise of its powers under Section 320 Cr.P.C. Any such attempt by the court would amount to alteration, addition and modification of Section 320 Cr.P.C, which is the exclusive domain of Legislature. There is no patent or latent ambiguity in the language of Section 320 Cr.P.C., which may justify its wider interpretation and include such offences in the docket of 'compoundable' offences which have been consciously kept out as non-compoundable. Nevertheless, the limited jurisdiction to compound an offence within the framework of Section 320 Cr.P.C. is not an embargo against invoking inherent powers by the High Court vested in it under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The High Court, keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of a case and for justifiable reasons can press Section 482 Cr.P.C. in aid to prevent abuse of the

process of any Court and/or to secure the ends of justice.

[12]. The High Court, therefore, having regard to the nature of the offence and the fact that parties have amicably settled their dispute and the victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings, can quash such proceedings in exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., even if the offences are non-compoundable. The High Court can indubitably evaluate the consequential effects of the offence beyond the body of an individual and thereafter adopt a pragmatic approach, to ensure that the felony, even if goes unpunished, does not tinker with or paralyze the very object of the administration of criminal justice system.

[13]. It appears to us those criminal proceedings involving non-heinous offences or where the offences are predominantly of a private nature, can be annulled irrespective of the fact that trial has already been concluded or appeal stands dismissed against conviction. Handing out punishment is not the sole form of delivering justice. Societal method of applying laws evenly is always subject to lawful exceptions. It goes without saying, that the cases where compromise is struck postconviction, the High Court ought to exercise such discretion with rectitude, keeping in view the circumstances surrounding the incident, the fashion in which the compromise has been arrived at, and with due regard to the nature and seriousness of the offence, besides the conduct of the accused, before and after the incidence. The touchstone for exercising the extraordinary power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. would be to secure the ends of justice. There can be no hard and fast line constricting the power of the High Court to do substantial justice. A restrictive construction of inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. may lead to rigid or specious justice, which in the given facts and circumstances of a case, may rather lead to grave injustice. On the other hand, in cases where heinous offences have been proved against perpetrators, no such benefit ought to be extended, as cautiously observed by this Court in *Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Ors.* [(2014) 6 SCC 466, ¶ 29], and *Laxmi Narayan* [(2019) 5 SCC 688, ¶ 15].

[14]. In other words, grave or serious offences or offences which involve moral turpitude or have a harmful effect on the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy, cannot be construed between two individuals or groups only, for such offences have the potential to impact the society at large. Effacing abominable offences through quashing process would not only send a wrong signal to the community but may also accord an undue benefit to unscrupulous habitual or professional offenders, who can secure a 'settlement' through duress, threats, social boycotts, bribes or other dubious means. It is well said that "let no guilty man escape, if it can be avoided."

10. 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.

11. 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/Charge sheet. 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.”

12. Considering the entire facts, compromise, and in the light of the above-mentioned judicial precedents, I believe that continuing these proceedings will not suffice any fruitful purpose whatsoever. In the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the Court invokes the inherent jurisdiction under section 482 Cr.P.C and quashes the FIR and all subsequent proceedings qua the petitioner(s). The bail bonds of the petitioner are accordingly discharged. All pending application(s), if any, stand closed.

**Petition allowed in the terms mentioned above.**

**(ANOOP CHITKARA)**  
**JUDGE**

**31.03.2022**

*Jyoti-II*

Whether speaking/reasoned:       Yes  
Whether reportable:               **No.**