

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

231

CRM-M-36260-2022
Date of Decision: 10.11.2022

Lovepreet Singh @ Lavi and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.Vivek Singla, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Anurag Bansal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Shubham Mehta, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., seeking quashing of FIR No. 0061 dated 08.04.2022, under Sections 307, 323, 148, 149 IPC (Section 325 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Kotwali Bathinda, District Bathinda (Annexure P-1), and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise-deed/affidavit dated 05.07.2022 (Annexure P-2).

In terms of order dated 17.08.2022, learned Additional District & Sessions Judge, Bathinda has submitted his report dated 05.09.2022. The relevant extracts of the report are as below :-

“There are as many as nine accused arrayed in the FIR and found involved during investigation. Only three accused, namely Rohit Bhargo, Gurpreet Singh @ Sewak @ Ninja and

Gurpreet Singh s/o Amarjit Singh were forwarded to face trial by the police whereas at the time of presentation of final report U/s 173 Cr.PC.

Six accused namely Amandeep Singh @ Amna, Jatinder Singh, Lavi r/o Bagha, Gurpreet Singh @ Motu s/o Narinder Singh, Happy s/o Gureep singh and Maan r/o Bandi, were yet to be arrested.

However, all the above named nine accused have got recorded their statements before this Court on 01.09.2022.

None of the accused of the above FIR is absconding.

Neither any accused has been declared as proclaimed offender, nor proceedings are going on to declare him/her as proclaimed offender

2. Sachin Kumar is complainant of the above FIR and there is only one victim/witness Munish Sharma @ Kaku. Both complainant, victim/witness have appeared and made their respective statements in support of the compromise so effected between them.

3. The trial is pending for recording statements of prosecution witnesses.

4. The compromise effected by the parties is quite genuine, voluntary and out of free will of the parties.”

Learned State counsel submits that he has no objection if the present FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed.

Relying upon its earlier judgments in 'Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others, (2012) 10 SCC 303' and 'The State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (2019) 5 SCC 688', a two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in 'Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC online SC 834' while dealing with power of High Court under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. to quash non-compoundable offences on the basis of compromise between the disputing parties has held:

“11. True it is that offences which are ‘non-compoundable’ cannot be compounded by a criminal court in purported exercise of its powers under [Section 320 Cr.P.C.](#) Any such attempt by the court would amount to alteration, addition and modification of [Section 320Cr.P.C.](#), which is the exclusive domain of Legislature. There is no patent or latent ambiguity in the language of [Section 320Cr.P.C.](#), which may justify its wider interpretation and include such offences in the docket of ‘compoundable’ offences which have been consciously kept out as non-compoundable. Nevertheless, the limited jurisdiction to compound an offence within the framework of [Section 320Cr.P.C.](#) is not an embargo against invoking inherent powers by the High Court vested in it under [Section 482Cr.P.C.](#) The High Court, keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of a case and for justifiable reasons can press [Section 482Cr.P.C.](#) in aid to prevent abuse of the process of any Court and/or to secure the ends of justice.

12. The High Court, therefore, having regard to the nature of the offence and the fact that parties have amicably settled their dispute and the victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings, can quash such proceedings in exercise of its inherent powers under [Section 482 Cr.P.C.](#), even if the offences are non-compoundable. The High Court can indubitably evaluate the consequential effects of the offence beyond the body of an individual and thereafter adopt a pragmatic approach, to ensure that the felony, even if goes unpunished, does not tinker with or paralyze the very object of the administration of criminal justice system.

13. It appears to us that criminal proceedings

involving non-heinous offences or where the offences are pre-dominantly of a private nature, can be annulled irrespective of the fact that trial has already been concluded or appeal stands dismissed against conviction. Handing out punishment is not the sole form of delivering justice. Societal method of applying laws evenly is always subject to lawful exceptions. It goes without saying, that the cases where compromise is struck post-conviction, the High Court ought to exercise such discretion with rectitude, keeping in view the circumstances surrounding the incident, the fashion in which the compromise has been arrived at, and with due regard to the nature and seriousness of the offence, besides the conduct of the accused, before and after the incidence. The touchstone for exercising the extraordinary power under [Section 482 Cr.P.C.](#) would be to secure the ends of justice. There can be no hard and fast line constricting the power of the High Court to do substantial justice. A restrictive construction of inherent powers under [Section 482 Cr.P.C.](#) may lead to rigid or specious justice, which in the given facts and circumstances of a case, may rather lead to grave injustice. On the other hand, in cases where heinous offences have been proved against perpetrators, no such benefit ought to be extended, as cautiously observed by this Court in [Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Ors.](#)³ and [Laxmi Narayan \(Supra\)](#).

14. In other words, grave or serious offences or offences which involve moral turpitude or have a harmful effect on the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy, cannot be construed betwixt two individuals or groups only, for such offences have the potential to impact the

society at large. Effacing abominable offences through quashing process would not only send a wrong signal to the community but may also accord an undue benefit to unscrupulous habitual or professional offenders, who can secure a ‘settlement’ through duress, threats, social boycotts, bribes or other dubious means. It is well said that “let no guilty man escape, if it can be avoided.”

From the perusal of the enclosed FIR, report of the Trial Court and compromise arrived between the parties, it transpires that contesting parties have amicably resolved their issue, thus, no useful purpose would be served by continuing the proceedings. The alleged offences are of pre-dominantly private in nature and no moral turpitude or interest of public at large is involved. There appears to be no chance of conviction, the continuance of the proceedings would just waste valuable judicial time and it is well-known fact that courts are already over burdened.

In view of above facts and circumstances, the present petition deserves to be allowed and accordingly is allowed. FIR No. 0061 dated 08.04.2022, under Sections 307, 323, 148, 149 IPC (Section 325 IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Kotwali Bathinda, District Bathinda (Anneuxre P-1) and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner(s).

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

10.11.2022
anju

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>