

290

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

CRM-M-29455-2022

Date of decision : 04.08.2022

Anand Saroop Singh @ Nand Saroop Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Krishan Singh Dadwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Neha Jain, Advocate for respondent Nos.2 to 11.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.67 dated 10.08.2016 registered under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Bholath, District Kapurthala (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

On 14.07.2022, this Court had passed the following order:-

“This is a petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.67 dated 10.08.2016 registered under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Bholath, District Kapurthala (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

*Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that in the present case, there are four accused persons, out of which, two accused persons i.e. the present petitioners have filed the present petition bearing No.CRM-M-29455-2022 and the present case is a case of partial compromise and has relied upon judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Jayrajsinh Digvijaysinh Rana Vs. State of Gujarat and another**, reported as **2012(12) SCC 401** to contend that even in case of a partial compromise, FIR can be quashed qua the accused with whom the compromise has been effected.*

Notice of motion for 04.08.2022.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Ms. Neha Jain, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent Nos.2 to 11.

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 abovesaid order, a report has been submitted

by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Bholath. The relevant portion of

the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“2. On the basis of the above said statements, the report is submitted as under please:

- 1. That total four persons arrayed as accused in the present FIR.*
 - 2. That two accused namely Balwinder Kaur and Tajinder Singh are proclaimed offenders in this case so far.*
 - 3. That the compromise effected between parties is genuine and correct and the same is not the result of any fraud or misrepresentation and is result of free will of the parties.*
 - 4. That except the present FIR, accused/petitioner Anand Saroop Singh @ Nand Saroop Singh is also involved in one another FIR bearing No.38 dated 19.03.2015 under Section 106/420 IPC, PS Mukerian, District Hoshiarpur in which he have been convicted and now his appeal is pending in the court of learned District & Sessions Judge, Hoshiarpur.*
 - 5. That there are total ten victims complainants in the present FIR.*
- 3. The statements of the parties alongwith copies of their identity proofs are submitted along with this report.*

Submitted please.

Yours Sincerely

Sd/- (Rahul Kumar)

Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate

Bholath-UID PB-0348”

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 petitioners 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 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 Nos.2 to 11 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.67 dated 10.08.2016 registered under Sections 420, 406, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Bholath, District Kapurthala (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent 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.

04.08.2022

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No