

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

227-A

**CRM-M-15260-2018 (O&M)
Date of decision: 22.12.2022**

Jagdev Singh and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Mr. Hardik Ahluwalia, Advocate for
Mr. Ruhani Chadha, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Pankaj Khullar, AAG Punjab.

Mr. A.S. Shergill, Advocate for
Mr. Navjot Singh, Advocate for respondent Nos. 2 to 7.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

The trial of the petitioners in case of DDR No. 29 dated 06.05.2011 in case FIR No. 30 dated 05.05.2011, under Sections 325, 323, 506, 148, 149 IPC registered at Police Station Bareta, District Mansa, has culminated into their conviction and they have been concurrently sentenced. They have challenged the order of conviction and sentence by way of an appeal before the learned Sessions Court, Bathinda. During the pendency thereof, it is claimed that the parties have entered a compromise dated 16.11.2017 (Annexure P-2) with the intervention of respectable persons.

Learned counsel for the petitioners relies upon a decision of Hon'ble Apex Court in Criminal Appeal No. 1393 of 2011 dated 25.10.2021 titled as Ramawatar Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh as per which FIR can be quashed even after the conviction of accused in a case.

Vide orders dated 29.03.2022, the learned Appellate Court was directed to record the statements of all concerned parties with regard to the genuineness and validity or otherwise of the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Mansa, has submitted a report vide letter dated 20.05.2022, which indicates that the parties appeared before him and got recorded their respective statements with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the report, the compromise arrived at between the parties is with free will and without any pressure or coercion.

Hon'ble the Apex Court in Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Ors. 2012(10) SCC 303 has held as under:-

“48. The question is with regard to the inherent power of the High Court in quashing the criminal proceedings against an offender who has settled his dispute with the victim of the crime but the crime in which he is allegedly involved is not compoundable Under Section 320 of the Code.

49. Section 482 of the Code, as its very language suggests, saves the inherent power of the High Court which it has by virtue of it being a superior court to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. It begins with the words, 'nothing in this Code' which means that the provision is an overriding provision. These words leave no manner of doubt that none of the provisions of the Code limits or restricts the inherent power. The guideline for exercise of such power is provided in Section 482 itself i.e., to prevent abuse of the process of any court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. As has been repeatedly stated that Section 482 confers no new powers on High Court; it merely safeguards existing inherent powers possessed by High Court necessary to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or to secure the ends of justice. It is equally well settled that the power is not to be resorted to if there is specific provision in the Code for the redress of the

grievance of an aggrieved party. It should be exercised very sparingly and it should not be exercised as against the express bar of law engrafted in any other provision of the Code.

50. In different situations, the inherent power may be exercised in different ways to achieve its ultimate objective. Formation of opinion by the High Court before it exercises inherent power Under Section 482 on either of the twin objectives, (i) to prevent abuse of the process of any court or (ii) to secure the ends of justice, is a sine qua non.

51. In the very nature of its constitution, it is the judicial obligation of the High Court to undo a wrong in course of administration of justice or to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process. This is founded on the legal maxim quando lex aliquid alicui concedit, conceditur et id sine qua res ipsa esse non potest. The full import of which is whenever anything is authorised, and especially if, as a matter of duty, required to be done by law, it is found impossible to do that thing unless something else not authorised in express terms be also done, may also be done, then that something else will be supplied by necessary intendment. Ex debito justitiae is inbuilt in such exercise; the whole idea is to do real, complete and substantial justice for which it exists. The power possessed by the High Court Under Section 482 of the Code is of wide amplitude but requires exercise with great caution and circumspection.”

In State of Karnataka v. L. Muniswami, AIR 1977 SC 1489, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has observed that the ends of justice are higher than ends of mere law, though justice has got to be administered according to the laws made by the legislature yet the Court proceeding ought not to be permitted to degenerate into a weapon of harassment or persecution.

The Larger Bench of this Court in the case of Kulwinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab & Anr. 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, while

discussing the scope of quashing of prosecution on the basis of compromise, by this Court in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., even in non-compoundable offence(s) has held that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C.. 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.

In the case of Sube Singh & Anr. vs. State of Haryana & Anr. CrI. Misc. No. M-38140 of 2011, decided on 09.04.2014, a Division Bench of this Court while dealing with the question, as to whether the criminal proceedings can be quashed in exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. even after the accused was found guilty and convicted by the trial court and the matter is sub-judice before the appellate Court, answered the reference in the affirmative. Relying upon the decisions rendered in Kulwinder Singh and Gian Singh (supra), the Court observed as under:

“16. The magnitude of inherent jurisdiction exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. with a view of prevent the abuse of law or to secure the ends of justice, however, is wide enough to include its power to quash the proceedings in relation to not only the non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 Cr.P.C. but such a power, in our considered view, is exercisable at any stage save that there is no express bar and invoking of such power is fully justified on facts and circumstances of the case.”

It has further been held that:

“20 ... Since there is no statutory embargo against invoking of power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. after conviction of an accused by

the trial Court and during pendency of appeal against such conviction, it appears to be a fit case to invoke the inherent jurisdiction and strike down the proceedings subject to certain safeguards.”

Adverting to the facts of present case, the parties have mutually settled their dispute and have buried the hatchet. There is nothing on record which is suggestive of the fact that the petitioners are pervious convicts.

Keeping in view the pronunciation of law and also the facts noticed above, in my opinion, it is a fit case to exercise the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed. DDR No. 29 dated 06.05.2011 in case FIR No. 30 dated 05.05.2011, under Sections 325, 323, 506, 148, 149 IPC registered at Police Station Bareta, District Mansa are hereby quashed qua the petitioners, on the basis of compromise dated 16.11.2017 (Annexure P-2), subject to depositing the costs of Rs.15,000/- by the petitioners with the Poor Patients' Welfare Fund of the Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research (PGIMER), Chandigarh.

As a consequence thereof, the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 15.02.2017 (Annexures P-3), passed by learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Budhlada, are also set aside and the petitioners are acquitted of the charges framed against them.

Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements made in the Court below.

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)
JUDGE

22.12.2022
Mangal Singh

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No