

257

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

**CRM-M-38695-2022
Date of decision : 08.12.2022**

YUVRAJ @ YAVI AND OTHERS

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Hitesh Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaiteshwar Singh, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab.

Mr. Mayank Gupta, Advocate
for the complainant/respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.0245 dated 08.12.2021, registered for offences punishable under Sections 324, 341 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Sujanpur, Tehsil and District Pathankot (Annexure P-1) on the basis of compromise.

2. At the outset, counsel for the petitioners points out that inadvertently in the headnote of the petition Section 341 IPC has been written instead of Section 323 IPC.

3. On oral request made by counsel for the petitioner, the same is

ordered to be corrected. Registry to carry out the necessary correction.

3. On 14.09.2022, the following order was passed :-

“The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by the petitioners facing trial in FIR No.0245 dated 08.12.2021, registered for offences punishable under Sections 324, 341 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Sujampur, Tehsil and District Pathankot and all consequential proceedings arising there-from qua the petitioners in view of the compromise dated 08.08.2022 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the matter already stands compromised vide compromise dated 08.08.2022 (Annexure P-2) and the challan is presented.

Notice of motion for 08.12.2022.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Gurdarshan Singh Sidhu, Asstt. A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Mr. Mayank Gupta, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and admits the fact of there being a compromise between the parties.

In view of the above, the parties, i.e. the petitioners as well as respondent No.2 are directed to appear before learned Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court on 29.09.2022. On their doing so, the learned Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court shall record their statements and furnish its report to this Court by the next date of hearing on the following aspects:-

1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR.
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 case 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.

A copy of the report be also sent to the Registrar Judicial of this Court.

Needless to say that in case for any reason the statements are not recorded on the aforesaid date, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter.”

4. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from CJM, Pathankot dated 04.10.2022 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

- “(i) As per record, three persons namely Yuvraj @ Yuvi, Rajat Mahajan @ Ajay Gupta and Shubham Chand @ Soopi are arrayed as accused.
- (ii) As per record, none of the accused has been declared proclaimed offender in this case.
- (iii) Compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence.
- (iv) As per record, accused are not involved in any other case.
- (v) ASI Surinder Kumar has appeared and made statement in court. As per statement, Suraj is the only complainant in the FIR.”

5. Ld. Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.

6. Similarly Ld. State Counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.

7. I have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

8. After considering judgment rendered by the Apex Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(10) SCC 303, State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (2019) 5 SCC 688, Kulwinder Singh & others vs. State of Punjab & another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and Ram Gopal and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 322 (Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 decided on 29th of September, 2021)**, the proposition of law that emerges from the aforesaid decisions rendered by Apex Court and this Court is :

(a) Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is not affected by Section 320 of the Code.

(b) However, wider the power greater the caution.

(c) The underlining principle while exercising such power is that it can be invoked to quash the proceedings recognizing compromise between the parties in the matters which are overwhelmingly and predominantly of civil character like commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes.

(d) The said power is not to be exercised in the prosecutions involving heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc. as such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society.

(e) Section 482 Cr.P.C. casts duty upon the High Court to advance interest of justice as well. It is in recognition of this

duty casted upon the High Court, that Apex Court held that the High Court would not refuse to quash FIR under Section 307 merely because FIR finds mention thereof. High Court can assess nature of injuries sustained, whether such injuries inflicted on vital/delicate parts of the body/nature of weapons used etc.

(f) Such exercise at the hands of High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and chargesheet is filed/charges framed during the trial. Such exercise cannot be carried out while the matter is still under investigation.

(g) While quashing FIR in non-compoundable offences even which are of private in nature, High Court is required to consider antecedents of the accused, conduct of the accused and whether he was absconding or whether he has managed the complainant to enter into a compromise.

9. Thus, keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise jurisdiction vested u/s 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR as :-

- (i) The present matter does not fall within the exceptions as carved out in **Laxmi Narayan's** case (supra).
- (ii) The offences are of private nature.
- (iii) The parties have compromised.
- (iv) As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.
- (v) Complainant/victim has entered into compromise on his own volition.

10. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.0245 dated 08.12.2021, registered for offences punishable under Sections 324, 323 and

34 of the Indian Penal Code, at Police Station Sujanpur, Tehsil and District Pathankot (Annexure P-1) and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

December 08, 2022
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

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