

248

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

CRM-M-24832-2022

Date of decision : 14.12.2022

SULAKHAN SINGH AND ORS

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Navdeep Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaiteshwar Singh, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. P.P.S. Brar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of complaint case No. COMI/2/2016 dated 24.12.2015 titled as **Gurmel Kaur vs. Sulakhan Singh and others**, registered for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC pending in the Court of JMIC, Gidderbaha (Annexure P-1) and summoning order dated 18.08.2017 passed by SDJM, Gidderbaha (Annexure P-2) on the basis of compromise.

2. On 31.08.2022, the following order was passed :-

“The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been

filed by the petitioners for quashing of a complaint case No. COMI/2/2016 dated 24.12.2015 titled as Gurmel Kaur vs. Sulakhan Singh and others, registered for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC and summoning order dated 18.08.2017 passed by SDJM, Gidderbaha.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the matter already stands compromised vide compromise dated 25.05.2022 (Annexure P-3).

Notice of motion for **14.12.2022**.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Gurdarshan Singh Sidhu, AAG, Punjab, who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of the State.

Mr. Paras Singh, Advocate for Ms. Kuljinder Bir Kaur, Advocate appears for respondent No.2 and admits the fact of there being compromise between the parties.

In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on **28.09.2022**.

On their doing so, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall record their statements and furnish its report to this Court by the next date of hearing on the following aspects:-

1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the complaint case.
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 case 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.

A copy of the report be also sent to the Registrar Judicial of this Court.

Needless to say that in case for any reason the statements are not recorded on the aforesaid date, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter. ”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from JMIC, Gidderbaha

dated 01.12.2022 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

- “1. Only four persons are arrayed as accused in the present complaint, who are petitioners in the petition filed before Hon'ble High Court and except them there is no other accused. Accused Harpal Singh, who is petitioner no. 3 in the petition before the Hon'ble High Court, has expired on 24.08.2022.
 2. As per the statement of ASI Mohan Singh, none of the accused has been declared proclaimed offender.
 3. In the given circumstances, I am satisfied that compromise has been effected between complainant/respondent and accused persons amicably, with their free consent, without any pressure and the same appears to be genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence and they got their statements recorded before the Court voluntarily and without any pressure.
 4. As per the statement of ASI Mohan Singh, none of the accused is involved in any other FIR.
 5. As per the statement of ASI Mohan Singh and complainant Gurmel Kaur, she herself is the only victim/aggrieved person of the present FIR.”
4. Petitioner No.3-Harpal Singh is stated to have unfortunately died during pendency of the present petition on 24th of August, 2022. Consequently, the proceedings *qua* him are ordered to be abated.
5. Ld. Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.
6. Similarly Ld. State Counsel has stated no objection in case the

FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.

7. I have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

8. After considering judgment rendered by the Apex Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(10) SCC 303, State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (2019) 5 SCC 688, Kulwinder Singh & others vs. State of Punjab & another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and Ram Gopal and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 322 (Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 decided on 29th of September, 2021)**, the proposition of law that emerges from the aforesaid decisions rendered by Apex Court and this Court is :

- (a) Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is not affected by Section 320 of the Code.
- (b) However, wider the power greater the caution.
- (c) The underlining principle while exercising such power is that it can be invoked to quash the proceedings recognizing compromise between the parties in the matters which are overwhelmingly and predominantly of civil character like commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes.
- (d) The said power is not to be exercised in the prosecutions involving heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc. as such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society.
- (e) Section 482 Cr.P.C. casts duty upon the High Court to

advance interest of justice as well. It is in recognition of this duty casted upon the High Court, that Apex Court held that the High Court would not refuse to quash FIR under Section 307 merely because FIR finds mention thereof. High Court can assess nature of injuries sustained, whether such injuries inflicted on vital/delicate parts of the body/nature of weapons used etc.

(f) Such exercise at the hands of High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and chargesheet is filed/charges framed during the trial. Such exercise cannot be carried out while the matter is still under investigation.

(g) While quashing FIR in non-compoundable offences even which are of private in nature, High Court is required to consider antecedents of the accused, conduct of the accused and whether he was absconding or whether he has managed the complainant to enter into a compromise.

9. Thus, keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise jurisdiction vested u/s 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR as :-

- (i) The present matter does not fall within the exceptions as carved out in **Laxmi Narayan's** case (supra).
- (ii) The offences are of private nature.
- (iii) The parties have compromised.
- (iv) As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.
- (v) Complainant/victim has entered into compromise on his own volition.

10. Consequently, the petition is allowed. Complaint Case No.

COMI/2/2016 dated 24.12.2015 titled as **Gurmel Kaur vs. Sulakhan Singh and others**, registered for offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC pending in the Court of JMIC, Gidderbaha (Annexure P-1) and summoning order dated 18.08.2017 passed by SDJM, Gidderbaha (Annexure P-2) and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners No.1, 2 and 4 only.

December 14, 2022
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No