

205

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-22471-2022

Date of decision : 10.11.2022

Jitendra Mishra and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. R.S. Rai, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Gautam Dutt, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vineet Sehgal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.251 dated 16.09.2021 registered under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Sushant Lok, Gurugram, District Gurugram and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

On 23.05.2022, this Court had passed the following order:-

“This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.251 dated 16.09.2021 registered under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Sushant Lok, Gurugram, District Gurugram and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the

basis of compromise.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr.Vikrant Pamboo, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1. Mr.Vineet Sehgal, Advocate, appears on behalf of complainant-respondent no.2 and admits the factum of compromise.

Learned senior counsel for the petitioners as well as learned counsel for respondent no.2 have jointly submitted that the matter has been compromised and as per the compromise, the first installment has been paid and the last installment is to be paid on 31.10.2022 and has thus, prayed that the matter be taken up after 31.10.2022.

Adjourned to 10.11.2022.

The parties are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court/Duty Magistrate for recording their statements qua compromise within a period of one month.

The Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court/Duty Magistrate 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.*

Further proceedings before the trial Court are stayed till the next date of hearing. However, stay of said proceedings would not come in the way of the parties to get their statements recorded or the Illaqa Magistrate/trial

Court/Duty Magistrate to record the said statements and prepare the report.”

In pursuance of the abovesaid order, a report has been submitted by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Gurugram. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“5. In view of statements of the complainant, accused and the Investigating officer, undersigned would like to report that:

- i) There are 3 accused persons in the present case namely, Jitendra Mishra, Pranav Ansal and Deepak,*
- ii) No accused was ever declared proclaimed offender.*
- iii) The compromise is genuine and entered into between the parties voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence.*
- (iv) Accused persons are not involved in any other FIR*
- (v) As per the statement of the Investigating officer there is only one complainant/victim in the present case namely, Sunil Miglani.”*

A perusal of the said report would show that the compromise has been found to be genuine, without any pressure or undue influence. It has been stated that the statements of the complainant as well as the accused have been recorded in the case and both have stated that the matter has been compromised and they have no objection in case the FIR is quashed. It is further stated that the statement of the complainant has been made voluntarily without any fear, coercion or pressure.

Learned Senior counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners were not declared proclaimed offender in the present case.

Learned counsel for the State, as per instructions has stated that the said 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 two parties.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the file. After perusing the report submitted by the trial Court, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners 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**”, reported as **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**”, reported as **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, the petition is allowed and FIR No.251 dated 16.09.2021 registered under Sections 120-B, 420, 467, 468, 471 IPC at Police Station Sushant Lok, Gurugram, District Gurugram and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise, are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid judgment.

10.11.2022

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No