

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-16358-2019

Date of Decision: 11.11.2022

Lalit and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present: - Ms. Ruchita Garg, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, Assistant Advocate General, Haryana.

Mr. Shiv Charan Bhola, Advocate for respondents No. 2 to 4.

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., for quashing FIR No. 0101 dated 23.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) registered under Sections 147, 148, 149, 285, 323 and 506 IPC and Section 25 of the Arms Act at Police Station Sector 65, Gurugram and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of affidavits/compromise Annexures P-2 to P-4.

Pursuant to the order dated 27.11.2019, passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the parties appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram, to get their statements recorded. Learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram, has submitted her report along with copies of statements of the parties vide letter No. 551 dated 07.02.2020 duly forwarded by the

learned District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram, vide letter No. 415/C-29 dated 07.02.2020.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioners, learned State Counsel, learned counsel for respondents No. 2 to 4 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, Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram, is satisfied that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. It has also been reported that there are four more FIRs registered against petitioner No. 5-Rajbir and three more FIRs registered against petitioner No. 4-Satbir.

Considering the report of learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Gurugram and the fact that the compromise will bring peace and harmony between the parties, aforesaid FIR No. 0101 dated 23.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed, qua petitioners, only.

Disposed of, accordingly.

November 11, 2022
rishu

(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned **Yes/No**

Whether Reportable **Yes/No**