

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

240

CRM-M-39744-2022

Date of Decision : 29.11.2022

Baljinder Singh @ Baljinder Singh Garcha and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

. Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.Abhishek Khullar, Advocate for
Mr. J.S.Jaidka, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Harmanpreet Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Harinderpal Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., seeking quashing of Complaint No.SC/2211/2022 dated 08.07.2022, under Sections 308, 450, 427, 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 of IPC titled as “Parampreet Singh Vs. Baljinder Singh and ors.” pending in the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, on the basis of compromise dated 17.08.2022 (Annexure P-1).

In terms of order dated 05.09.2022, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, has submitted her report dated 04.11.2022. The relevant extracts of the report are as below :-

“Further, as desired, it is submitted that total five

*accused namely Baljinder Singh @ Baljinder Singh Garcha, Ravinder Singh, Ajmer Singh @ Ajmer Singh Garcha, Jaswinder Singh and Sarpreet Singh have been arrayed as accused in this case. **All the accused except accused Sarpreet Singh son of Inderjit Singh are the party to the said compromise effected with the complainant. Accused Sarpreet Singh son of Inderjit Singh has been declared proclaimed offender** in this case vide order dated 31.5.2022 by the court of Sh. Taranjeet Singh Simra, JMIC, Ludhiana. This case is at the stage of framing of charge. It is also submitted that from the statements of the parties and the compromise dated 17.8.2022, it appears that the compromise effected between the above said parties is genuine, voluntary, without any coercion and undue influence.”*

Learned State counsel would submit that he has no objection if the present complaint and consequential proceedings are quashed.

Learned counsel for the complainant submits that he has no grouse against Sarpreet Singh, who has been declared proclaimed offender. He further submits that he would not raise any complaint against aforesaid accused, even though, no compromise has been arrived between complainant and aforesaid accused. He has settled his grouse with all the accused and he has no grievance against anyone.

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 320 Cr.P.C.](#), which is the exclusive domain of Legislature. There is no patent or latent ambiguity in the language of [Section 320 Cr.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 320 Cr.P.C.](#) is not an embargo against invoking inherent powers by the High Court vested in it under [Section 482 Cr.P.C.](#) The High Court, keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of a case and for justifiable reasons can press [Section 482 Cr.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 complaint, 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. Complaint No.SC/2211/2022 dated 08.07.2022, under Sections 308, 450, 427, 323, 324, 506, 148, 149 of IPC titled as "Parampreet Singh Vs. Baljinder Singh and ors." pending in the Court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Ludhiana, on the basis of compromise dated 17.08.2022 is quashed qua the petitioner(s).

29.11.2022
anju

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No