

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

268

**CRM-M-42320-2021
Decided on : 19.09.2022**

Sukhwinder Kumar and others

. . . Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

. . . Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH

PRESENT: Mr. Priyavrat Parashar, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Vikas Bhardwaj, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Neeraj Goel, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition under Section 482, Cr.P.C., has been filed by the petitioners, for quashing of FIR No. 78, dated 26.04.2020 (Annexure P-1), for the offences punishable under Sections 435, 34, 506 of IPC and Sections 3(r), 3(s) and 3(2)(iii) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal, and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 04.08.2021 (Annexure P-2).
2. Vide order dated 07.10.2021, the affected parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to the compromise. The trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was to submit a report in this regard giving certain details as enumerated in the said order.
3. Pursuant to the order dated 07.10.2021, passed by this Court, the parties have appeared before learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Special

Court, Kaithal, and as per report dated 25.10.2021, submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements in Court. The operative part of the report received from learned Court below is as under:-

“As directed, statements of complainant 'JS' (a member of Scheduled Caste) and accused persons namely Sukhwinder Kumar, Sandeep and Jagjeet, present before the Court, being affected parties, have been recorded in respect of settlement/effecting compromise between them in aforesaid FIR. Afore-named accused appeared alongwith their counsel(s) Shri Nitin Chhabra and Shri Davinder Gors and Complainant 'JS' (a member of Scheduled Caste) appeared alongwith counsel Shri Sachin Jain.

Complainant 'JS' has made statement that he is complainant in the present FIR. He is resident of resident of Ward No.9, Sanjay Colony, Cheeka, District Kaithal. An amicable settlement has been entered with accused persons namely Sukhwinder Kumar, Sandeep and Jagjeet, with the intervention of respectable persons of the locality, in the present case. Now, he has no grudges against accused persons. He is making his statement voluntarily, without any threat or coercion. Compromise Ex.C1 (placed on record) has been effected between him and accused persons. It bears his signature. He has no objection in case of quashment of FIR No.78 dated 26.04.2020, registered against accused persons, at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal. Their compromise may kindly be accepted.

Accused persons i.e. (1). Sukhwinder Kumar son of Krishan Kumar, aged about 30 years. (2). Sandeep son of Krishan Kumar, aged about 26 years and (3). Jagjeet son of Prithavi Singh, aged about 35 years, all residents of Ward No.9, Sanjay Colony, Cheeka, District Kaithal, have made their joint statement that they are accused in the aforesaid FIR bearing No.78 dated 26.04.2020, registered at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal and Complainant 'JS' (a member of Scheduled Caste) aged about 38 years, son of Shri 'RS', resident of Ward No.9, Sanjay Colony, Cheeka, District Kaithal, has compromised the matter with them, as per his free will, voluntarily and without any threat or coercion. No other criminal case is pending against them. They have never been declared as proclaimed offenders. Compromise Ex.C1 (placed on

record) bear their signatures. It may kindly be accepted.

As per the aforesaid statements of parties, they being residents of same village and in order to maintain the peace and brotherhood, have amicably settled the matter with the intervention of respectable persons of the village. Compromise Ex.C1 has also been placed on record duly signed by both the appearing parties. Complainant 'JS' has no objection in case of quashment of the proceedings against accused persons in the aforesaid FIR, registered at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal. They have been duly identified by their counsel(s).

Thus, it is safely concluded that compromise has been voluntarily effected between the parties (complainant-aggrieved and all accused booked in the FIR), which appears to be genuine, in the present FIR bearing No.78 dated 26.04.2020, registered at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal.

As per report dated 25.10.2021 taken from SHO Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal, afore-named accused have not been declared proclaimed offenders in any criminal case, till date.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners urged that due to intervention of the respectable and elderly people of the society, the matter has been resolved and private parties have effected a compromise dated 04.08.2021 (Annexure P-2). At present, there remains no dispute amongst the private parties. He further submits that in view of the compromise so effected between the private parties, pendency of the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings emanating therefrom would be sheer abuse of the process of law.

5. Learned State counsel as also learned counsel for respondent No. 2, after going through the statements and the report received from learned Court below, very fairly admit that the private parties have resolved their dispute and effected a compromise and that they have no objection if the impugned FIR and all the consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis

of the compromise.

6. The Full Bench of this Court in the matter of Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, has observed as under:

“(28) To conclude, it can safely be said that there can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the Court to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. The only principle that can be laid down is the one which has been incorporated in the Section itself, i.e., "to prevent abuse of the process of any Court" or "to secure the ends of justice”.

(29) In Mrs. Shakuntala Sawhney v. Mrs. Kaushalya Sawhney and others, Hon'ble Krishna Iyer, J. aptly summoned up the essence of compromise in the following words:

“The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship of reunion.”

(30) The power to do complete justice is the very essence of every judicial justice dispensation system. It cannot be diluted by distorted perceptions and is not a slave to anything, except to the caution and circumspection, the standards of which the Court sets before it, in exercise of such plenary and unfettered power inherently vested in it while donning the cloak of compassion to achieve the ends of justice.

(31) No embargo, be in the shape of Section 320(9) of the Cr.P.C., or any other such curtailment, can whittle down the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C.

(32) The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour. It is the soul of justice and if the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is used to enhance such a compromise which, in turn, enhances the social amity and reduces friction, then it truly is "finest hour of justice". Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters, commercial transactions and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. in the event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases. There can never be any such rigid rule to prescribe the exercise of such power, especially in the absence of any premonitions to forecast and predict eventualities which the cause of justice may throw up during the course of a litigation.

(33) *The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.*

(34) *The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined para-meters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever-lasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.”*

7. The legal principles as laid down for quashing of the judgment were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another**, (2012) 10 SCC 303. Furthermore, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in the matter of **Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another**, (2017) 9 SCC 641.

8. The Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in the matter of **Ramgopal and another v. State of Madhya Pradesh**, 2021 SCC Online SC 834, that the matters which can be categorized as personal in nature or in the matter in which the nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or commission of

an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of which would override public interest, the Court can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties. The observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is extracted as under:-

“19. We thus sum-up and hold that as opposed to Section 320 Cr.P.C. where the Court is squarely guided by the compromise between the parties in respect of offences ‘compoundable’ within the statutory framework, the extraordinary power enjoined upon a High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. or vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution, can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of Section 320 Cr.P.C. Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings, bearing in mind: (i) Nature and effect of the offence on the conscious of the society; (ii) Seriousness of the injury, if any; (iii) Voluntary nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; & (iv) Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations.”

9. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through the material available on record, this Court finds that there appears to be substance in the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners that pendency of the present criminal litigation would be abuse of process of law since the chances of conviction of the petitioners are bleak in view of the compromise so effected between the private parties.

10. The report alongwith statements of the affected parties received from learned Court below would reveal that the aggrieved person has genuinely effected a compromise with the petitioners and he has no objection if the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed.

11. Keeping in view totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the ratio of the judgments in the cases of **Gian Singh (supra)**, **Ramgopal (supra)** and **Kulwinder Singh (supra)**, this petition is accepted and FIR No. 78, dated 26.04.2020 (Annexure P-1), for

the offences punishable under Sections 435, 34, 506 of IPC and Sections 3(r), 3(s) and 3(2)(iii) of the Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes (prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 at Police Station Cheeka, District Kaithal, and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners, in view of compromise dated 04.08.2021 (Annexure P-2).

12. Petition stands disposed of.

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

September 19, 2022

J.Ram

Whether speaking/reasoned: *Yes/No*
Whether Reportable: *Yes/No*