

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

286

CRM-M-26149-2022
Decided on : 27.07.2022

Pritpal Singh and others

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Rakesh Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Arjun Atri, Advocate
for respondents No. 2 to 4.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 32 dated 25.04.2016 under Sections 323, 341 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Sanour, District Patiala (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising on the basis of the compromise.

On 04.07.2022, 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. 32 dated 25.04.2016 registered under Sections 323, 341 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sanour, District Patiala (Annexure P-1) and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Notice of motion for 27.07.2022.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Arjun Atri, Advocate appears on behalf of respondents No. 2 to 4 and filed his power of attorney, same is taken on record.

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.”*

In pursuance of the said order, a report has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Patiala to the Registrar of this Court. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“ASI Sukhdev Singh, No. 3102/Patiala, Investigating Officer P.S. Sanour has suffered statement that three persons namely Pritpal Singh @ Pali, Gagandeep Singh@ Monu @ Harpreet

Singh and Davinder Kaur are arrayed as accused in the present FIR and no person has been declared proclaimed offender in this case. There are two victims/ complainant in this case namely Manjit Kaur and Kulvinder Kaur.

From the statements of the parties, it appears to the Court that the complainant Manjit Kaur and injured Kulvinder Kaur and all accused namely Pritpal Singh @ Pali, Gagandeep Singh@ Monu @ Harpreet Singh and Davinder Kaur effected compromise without any pressure, coercion and same has been done with the free consent of the parties and compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. As per the statement of ASI Sukhdev Singh, Investigating Officer of this case only three persons are arrayed as accused in the present FIR and no person has been declared proclaimed offender in this case and all accused are not involved in any other FIR. There are two victims/ complainant in this case namely Manjit Kaur and Kulvinder Kaur.

The copies of statements of the persons, named above are enclosed herewith for kind perusal of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court.

Submitted please.”

A perusal of the above report would show that it has been stated that the statements of the complainant as well as the petitioners have been recorded in the case and they 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 counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that none of the petitioners were declared proclaimed offender in the present case and are not involved in any other case.

Learned counsel for the State, as per instructions, has stated that the abovesaid facts are correct.

Learned counsel for respondents No. 2 to 4 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 as well reply submitted on behalf of the State, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners and the complainant and the present FIR having been compromised deserves to be quashed. 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, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 32 dated 25.04.2016 under Sections 323, 341 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Sanour, District Patiala (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising on the basis of the compromise, are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.

-

27.07.2022

Mehak

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No