

274

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

CRM-M-31442-2022
Date of decision : 27.09.2022

Bhupinder Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Parvez Akhtar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Iqbal S. Mann, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Kuldeep Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.279 dated 20.09.2019 registered under Sections 379 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 411 of IPC has been added later on) at Police Station Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

On 21.07.2022, this Court had passed the following order:-

“CRM-25339-2022

This is an application filed for grant of leave under Rule 3/A(1) of Chapter VI, Part B, Volume V of Punjab and Haryana High Court Rules and Orders to file the present petition.

In view of averments made in the application, the same

is allowed and leave is granted under the aforesaid Rules and Orders to file the present petition.

Main case

This is a petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.279 dated 20.09.2019 registered under Sections 379 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 411 of IPC has been added later on) at Police Station Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that all the persons concerned are party to the compromise.

Notice of motion for 10.08.2022.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Sarabjit S. Cheema, AAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

The parties are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements qua compromise within a period of 10 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 Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sangrur. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“Accordingly, statements of the petitioners as well as that of complainant were recorded. Through the same, the parties stated in unison that they had entered into a compromise without any extraneous influence, coercion and on their own volition. The complainant/respondent stated in specific terms that he had no objection if the quashing proceedings filed by the petitioners/accused are accepted. Both the parties were identified by their respective advocates. Parties to the compromise have shown their identity cards and photocopies of the same were taken on record. The same was owned up by the petitioners as well as respondent who submitted in unison that they had executed the compromise out of their own free volition. They were also identified their signatures upon the same.

Accordingly, on the basis of statement of parties to compromise, this Court is satisfied that aforesaid statement made by the parties are given voluntarily and their compromise has been arrived at without any coercion or undue influence from either side. The copies of the statements, identity cards are attached herewith.”

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 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.279 dated 20.09.2019 registered under Sections 379 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 411 of IPC has been added later on) at Police Station Bhawanigarh, District Sangrur (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.

27.09.2022

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No