

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-12478-2022

Date of Decision: 22.09.2022

Ram Murti

.... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present: - Mr. J.S. Johal, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Saurabh Singla, Advocate for

Mr. Pardeep Bajaj, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing FIR No. 0141 dated 28.02.2018 (Annexure P-1), registered under Sections 383, 420, 506 and 120-B IPC (Sections 342, 384, 386, 467, 468 and 471 IPC were added later on) at Police Station Sector-5, District Panchkula and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 31.07.2021 (Annexure P-2) effected between the parties.

Pursuant to the order dated 25.03.2022, passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula, to get their statements recorded. Learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula, submitted his report along

with statements of the parties vide letter No. 357 dated 07.04.2022 duly forwarded by learned District and Sessions Judge, Panchkula, vide letter No. 921 dated 07.04.2022.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioner, learned State Counsel, learned counsel for respondent No. 2 and gone through the relevant record.

It is now well settled that the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings in non-compoundable cases on the basis of settlement between the parties for securing the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process where the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case. Criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character particularly those arising out of commercial transaction or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family dispute can be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire dispute among themselves. However, such power cannot be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape dacoity, etc. which are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, prosecution for offences alleged to have been committed under special enactments like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servant while working in that capacity cannot be quashed on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender. For judicial precedents in this regard, reference

may be made to *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and anr., 2012 (4) RAJ 549: Narinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab (Supreme Court) : 2014 (2) RCR (Criminal) 482, State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (Supreme Court) : 2019 (2) RCR (Criminal) 255 and Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others (Punjab and Haryana High Court) : 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052.*

According to the report, learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula, is satisfied that the compromise effected between the parties is result of their free will and violation.

Considering the report of learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panchkula dated 07.04.2022 and the fact that the compromise will bring peace and harmony between the parties, aforesaid FIR No. 0141 dated 28.02.2018 (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed, qua the petitioner only.

Disposed of, accordingly

September 22, 2022
rishu

(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE

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