

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

(271)

CRM-M-14831-2022

Date of decision: - 02.05.2022

Surinder Pal Bansal

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present:- Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Tapish Gupta, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.77 dated 25.04.2021 registered under Sections 406 and 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Pasyana, District Patiala (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

On 07.04.2022, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“This is a petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.77 dated 25.04.2021 registered under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Pasyana, District

Patiala (Annexure P-1) 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 02.05.2022.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Tapish Gupta, 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 15 days. 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.*

Adjourned to 05.04.2022.”

In pursuance of the said order, the report has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Patiala to the Registrar of this Court.

The relevant part of the report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“Sub Inspector Sohan Singh, No.256/PTA, Police Station Passiana, Investigating Officer of the present case has appeared and suffered his statement as follows: -

- 1. That there is only one accused as mentioned in the FIR.*
- 2. There is no accused in this case is proclaimed offender.*
- 3. That compromise is genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence out of the free will of the parties.*
- 4. Accused Surinder Pal Bansal is not involved in any other FIR.*

5. *There is one complainant i.e. Meena Mittal and has appeared before the Court. There is no other complainant or victim .*

Perusal of your goodself and necessary action, please.

Report is hereby submitted please.

Yours faithfully,

(Davinder Singh),

Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,

Patiala-PB00575”

A perusal of the said report would show that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the case, who have stated that the matter has been compromised and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. They have further stated that the said compromise is being entered into with there genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that there is no other FIR against the petitioner and he has not been declared proclaimed offender. Learned counsel for the State, as per instructions, has stated that this fact is correct.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has again reiterated that the matter has been settled and the said compromise is in the interest of all the persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the parties.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the file.

After perusing the report submitted by the learned 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, this petition is allowed and FIR No.77 dated 25.04.2021 registered under Sections 406, 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Pasyana, District Patiala (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioner.

May 02, 2022
naresh.k

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes
Whether reportable?	No