

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-13091-2021

Date of decision : 16.09.2022

Prithvi Singh @ Soma

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Ms. Ishita Jain, Advocate for
Mr. Namit Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.121 dated 25.06.2020, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 406, 370 of IPC & Section 24 of Immigration Act at Police Station Dhand, District Kaithal, on the basis of compromise/settlement dated 08.01.2021 (Annexure P-2).

2. On 23.03.2021, the following order was passed:-

“Prayer made in this petition is for quashing of FIR as well as all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Notice of motion for 19.07.2021.

At this stage, Mr. DPS Joura, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent No.2.

In the meanwhile, parties would appear before the Illaqa Magistrate on 06.04.2021 for recording their statements. The concerned Court would file its report in the context of validity and genuineness of the

compromise in question. The Court shall make a report in respect of antecedent behaviour of criminal activity of the accused and also with regard to total number of accused involved in the case and his/their status of being proclaimed offender/person.”

5. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from District and Sessions Judge, Kaithal dated 21.05.2021 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the compromise entered between the parties is of their free will and without any undue influence, threat, fear or coercion.

6. Mr. Sandeep Sharma, Advocate appears for respondent No.2 and admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioner are quashed.

7. Similarly learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

9. After considering judgment rendered by the Apex Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(10) SCC 303, State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (2019) 5 SCC 688, Kulwinder Singh & others Vs. State of Punjab & another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and Ram Gopal and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 322 (Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 decided on 29th of September, 2021)**, the proposition of law that emerges from the aforesaid decisions rendered by Apex Court and this Court is :

- (a) Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is not affected by Section 320 of the Code.
- (b) However, wider the power greater the caution.
- (c) The underlining principle while exercising such power is that it can be invoked to quash the proceedings recognizing compromise between the parties in the matters which are overwhelmingly and predominantly of civil character like commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes.
- (d) The said power is not to be exercised in the prosecutions involving heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc. as such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society.
- (e) Section 482 Cr.P.C. casts duty upon the High Court to advance interest of justice as well. It is in recognition of this duty casted upon the High Court, that Apex Court held that the High Court would not refuse to quash FIR under Section 307 merely because FIR finds mention thereof. High Court can assess nature of injuries sustained, whether such injuries inflicted on vital/delicate parts of the body/nature of weapons used etc.
- (f) Such exercise at the hands of High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and chargesheet is filed/charges framed during the trial. Such exercise cannot be carried out while the matter is still under investigation.
- (g) While quashing FIR in non-compoundable offences even which are of private in nature, High Court is required to consider antecedents of the accused, conduct of the accused and whether he was absconding or whether he has managed the complainant to enter into a compromise.

10. Thus, keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise jurisdiction vested u/s 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR as :-

- (i) The present matter does not fall within the exceptions as carved out in **Laxmi Narayan's** case (supra).
- (ii) The offences are of private nature.
- (iii) The parties have compromised.
- (iv) As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.
- (v) Complainant/victim has entered into compromise on his own volition.

11. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.121 dated 25.06.2020, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 406, 370 of IPC & Section 24 of Immigration Act at Police Station Dhand, District Kaithal and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

16.09.2022

Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes

Whether Reportable :

No