

221

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

**CRM-M-8389-2016
Date of Decision: 02.12.2022**

Varun Dass

..... Petitioner

Versus

U.T. Chandigarh and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Sameer Sachdeva, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Rajeev Anand, A.P.P., U.T., Chandigarh
for respondent No.1/State.

Mr. B.S. Bhatia, Advocate
for respondent No.2/complainant.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.122 dated 14.04.2012 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sector-11, Chandigarh and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the statement made by respondent No.2/complainant before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Chandigarh on 15.07.2015 (Annexure P-2).

Vide order dated 27.10.2022, statements of learned counsel for the parties was recorded to the effect that the parties will appear before the concerned Court for recording of their statements.

In compliance thereof, the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class,

Chandigarh, has submitted a consolidated report, vide letter dated 07.11.2022, which indicates that the parties appeared before the Magistrate and got recorded their respective statements with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the report, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure or coercion from any corner. Relevant extract of the said report is reproduced as under:

“ - x - x - x -

5. Considering the statements of parties i.e. complainant and the accused that they amicably settled their dispute and now the complainant does not want to take any further action against the accused, so in my considered opinion the compromise effected between the parties is quite genuine, without any coercion or undue influence from any side. Therefore, the report as sought by Your Lordship is being sent for your kind perusal.

- x - x - x -”

A perusal of the said report would show that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the case, who have stated that the matter has been compromised and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. They have further stated that the said compromise arrived at between them is genuine, voluntary and without any pressure.

Learned counsel for respondent No.1/U.T., Chandigarh does not raise any serious dispute regarding quashing of the FIR in question.

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 parties.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the

file.

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., 1973, 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.

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of "**Gian Singh Vs. 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 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 pre-dominantly 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 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.”

In “*Shakuntala Sawhney Vs. Kaushalya Sawhney*”, 1979 (3)

SCR 639, at P 642, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the finest hour of Justice arises propitiously when parties, who fell apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.

Considering the entire facts, compromise arrived at between the parties, statements of the parties recorded before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and also report dated 07.11.2022, submitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Chandigarh, since the parties have arrived at a compromise by amicably settling their disputes and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose will be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Further, in the light of the abovementioned judicial precedents, when the parties have entered into a compromise then continuation of the proceedings would be mere an abuse of process of the Court.

In order to prevent unnecessary continuation of criminal proceedings on the ground that there are bleak chances of conviction in the case, I am of the considered view that it would be in fitness of things to quash the proceedings on the basis of compromise and by quashing the FIR while accepting the prayer of the petitioner, would be securing the ends of justice.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.122 dated 14.04.2012 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sector-11, Chandigarh and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioner. However, the same would be subject to payment of costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with the **“Poor Patients' Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh”** and the said amount would be

spent for the treatment of poor patients within the knowledge of its Medical Superintendent.

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

All pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

02.12.2022

Apurva

**(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No