

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-35245-2020**Date of Decision: 23.11.2022**

Puran Singh & Ors.

... Petitioners

VS.

State of Punjab & Ors.

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. Vishal Munjal, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. Aman Dhir, DAG Punjab

Mr. Vipin Mahajan, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 to 4

Sandeep Moudgil, J. (Oral)

(1) The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed for quashing of cross version vide GD No.25 dated 27.04.2020, under Sections 326/325/324/323/148/149 IPC (Annexure P2) in FIR No.30 dated 28.03.2020 registered at Police Station Bhaini Mian Khan, District Gurdaspur and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 08.06.2020 (Annexure P3).

(2) Vide order dated 18.08.2022, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court for report with regard to the genuineness of the compromise.

(3) The report dated 04.10.2022 has been received from learned JMIC, Gurdaspur, stating that the parties have entered into a compromise without any undue influence or pressure.

(4) The Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in case **Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052** and Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in case **Sube Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and another, 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102** observed that compounding of offence can be allowed even after conviction, during proceedings of the appeal against conviction pending in Sessions Court and in case of involving non-compoundable offence.

(5) The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another. 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543** has held as under:-

"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. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R. may be exercised where the offender and victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case 2 of 4 and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the

offences under special statutes like [Prevention of Corruption Act](#) or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity etc; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personnel in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and wrongdoer and whether to secure the 3 of 4 ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding."

- (6) The same view has been reiterated by Hon'ble the Apex Court in case **Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) RCR (Criminal) 482.**

(7) It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be wastage of judicial time and sheer abuse of process of law.

(8) In view of above, the prayer made in the present petition is allowed and the above mentioned GD No.25 dated 27.04.2020 in FIR No. 30 dated 28.03.2020, and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioners in view of compromise.

(9) Disposed off.

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

23.11.2022

V.Vishal

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?

2. Whether reportable?

(Sandeep Moudgil)
Judge

Yes/No

Yes/No