

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

268

**CRM-M-39227-2021
Date of Decision : 11.10.2022**

Gurjaipal Singh and another

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present : Mr. Gagandeep Rana, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, Asstt. A.G., Haryana
for the respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Vikas Bishnoi Godara, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.134 dated 08.03.2021 registered under Sections 285, 34 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Kundli, District Sonapat (**Annexure P-1**) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 05.09.2021 (**Annexure P-2**) effected between the private parties.

Pursuant to order dated 21.09.2021 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, the private parties appeared before learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat to get their statements recorded. Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat submitted his report along with copies of statements of the

parties vide letter dated 17.11.2021 through learned District and Sessions Judge, Sonapat which is taken on record.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioners, learned State Counsel and learned counsel for respondent No.2 and gone through the relevant record.

It is now well settled that the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings in non-compoundable cases on the basis of settlement between the parties for securing the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process where the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case. Criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character particularly those arising out of commercial transaction or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family dispute can be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire dispute among themselves. However, such power cannot be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape dacoity, etc. which are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, prosecution for offences alleged to have been committed under special enactments like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servant while working in that capacity cannot be quashed on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender. For judicial precedents in this regard, reference may be made to ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another : 2012(4) RCR***

***Criminal) 543, Narinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab (Supreme Court)
: 2014 (2) RCR (Criminal) 482, State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Laxmi
Narayan and others (Supreme Court) : 2019 (2) RCR (Criminal) 255
and Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others
(Punjab and Haryana High Court) : 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052.***

According to the report, learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat is satisfied that compromise effected between the parties is genuine, outcome of free consent of the parties and is without coercion from any quarter.

Considering the report dated 17.11.2021 of learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat and the fact that the compromise will bring peace and harmony between the parties, aforesaid FIR No.134 dated 08.03.2021 (**Annexure P-1**) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed, qua the petitioners only.

Disposed of, accordingly.

**(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE**

11.10.2022
Kothiyal

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No