

267

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

CRM-38343-2022 in/and
CRA-S-1616-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision : 08.12.2022

Haider Ali

...Appellant

Versus

State of Haryana

...Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sukhcharan Singh Gill, Advocate for the appellant.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Angrej Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Ranwant Siingh, Advocate for the complainant.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the main appeal is taken on Board today itself for final disposal.

Challenge in the present appeal is to the judgment of conviction dated 10.08.2022 and also order of sentence dated 12.08.2022, vide which, the appellant has been convicted by the Sessions Judge, Gurugram, under Section 379-A of IPC and has been sentenced as under:-

“In view of above mentioned observations the convict is hereby awarded the sentence as under:

<i>For the commission of offence punishable under Section 379-A IPC</i>	<i>To undergo rigorous imprisonment for a period of five years & pay a fine of Rs.25,000/-. In case of default in payment of fine, the convict shall have to undergo imprisonment for a period of one year in addition.</i>
---	---

Learned counsel for the applicant-appellant has moved an application bearing No.CRM-38343-2022 under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for compounding of offence and quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise dated 19.09.2022. It is submitted by the counsel that the said compromise is genuine and bona fide and has been entered into without any undue influence or coercion.

On 21.11.2022, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

*“Learned counsel for the applicant-appellant as well as learned counsel for the complainant have jointly submitted that in the present case, although initially there were two accused persons, but the second accused i.e., Juyen Rana has been acquitted by the Court and the present applicantappellant had been convicted. It is further submitted that the matter has now been compromised between the parties and a reference has been made to the compromise deed dated 19.09.2022 (Annexure A-2). It is further submitted that in view of the law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case titled as **“Ramgopal and another Vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh,** passed in **Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012, dated 29.09.2021**, the main appeal deserves to be allowed and the judgment of the Sessions Judge, Gurugram deserves to be set aside. It is also submitted that the parties are ready to make their statements before the trial Court within a period of 15*

days from today.

Notice of the applications for 08.12.2022.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Mr. Ranwant Sangha, Advocate, appears on behalf of the complainant and admits the factum of compromise.

The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court for recording their statements qua compromise within a period of 15 days from today.

The trial Court is directed to submit a report on or before the next date of hearing containing the following information:-

- 1. Number of persons arrayed as accused.*
- 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 FIR 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.*

Till the next date of hearing, the applicant-appellant is ordered to be released on interim bail, subject to his furnishing personal bonds and surety to the satisfaction of the trial Court.”

In pursuance of the said order, report has been submitted by the District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“The point wise report is as under:-

	<i>Number of persons</i>	<i>Two namely Haider Ali</i>
<i>1</i>	<i>arrayed as accused</i>	<i>and Juen Rana.</i>

2	<i>Whether any person is proclaimed offender?</i>	<i>No</i>
3	<i>Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence?</i>	<i>The compromise between the parties is voluntary, without any threat, pressure, coercion or undue influence. The same is genuine.</i>
4	<i>Whether the accused person are involved in any other FIR or not?</i>	<i>As per statement of Investigating Officer, No.</i>
5	<i>The trial Court is directed to record the statement of the Investigating Officer as to how many victims/complaints are there in the FIR.</i>	<i>The statement of Investigating Officer has been recorded. As per Investigating Officer the number of victim/complainant is only one.</i>

A perusal of the said report would show that the compromise which has been effected is voluntary, without any threat, pressure, coercion or undue influence and the same is genuine.

The brief facts of the present case are that FIR No.52 dated 08.02.2021 was registered under Sections 379-A/34 of IPC at Sector 50, Gurugram against two accused i.e. present appellant and one Juyen Rana and the said registration was on the complaint of Mrs. Sumitra on the allegations that they had snatched her mobile phone. Co-accused of the appellant-Juyen Rana was acquitted whereas the present appellant-Haider Ali was convicted under Section 379-A of IPC and was sentenced as has detailed

been hereinabove.

Learned counsel for the appellant has submitted that the compromise is genuine and bonafide and has referred to the judgment of a Co-ordinate Bench of this Court in ***CRM-M-17272-2015 dated 28.01.2016*** titled as “***Ram Parkash and others Vs. State of Punjab and others***” to contend that under similar circumstances, petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. was entertained and the FIR with all subsequent proceedings was quashed and even the judgment of conviction was set aside on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the appellant has also relied upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Criminal Appeal no.1489 of 2012*** titled as “***Ramgopal & Anr. vs. The State of Madhya Pradesh***” and connected matter dated 29.09.2021 and has prayed that the present petition be allowed.

Learned State counsel has opposed the present application for quashing and submitted that in the present case, the appellant has already been convicted.

This Court has heard learned counsel for the parties and has perused the record.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Ramgopal and Anr.'s*** case (supra) has discussed in detail the power of the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. along with other issues. The relevant portion of said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“2. *The prosecution version, arising out of FIR dated 3rd November 2000, Police Station Ambah, Morena, M.P. is*

that on account of certain monetary dispute, the Appellants abused and assaulted Padam Singh (Complainant). Appellant No.1 is alleged to have struck the Complainant with a pharsa , which resultantly cut off the little finger of his left hand. Appellant No.2 also struck lathi blows on the body of the Complainant. Appellants were thereafter committed for trial under Sections 294, 323 and 326 read with 34 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter, 'IPC') and Section 3 of the Prevention of Atrocities (Scheduled Caste and Scheduled Tribes) Act, 1989. Upon analyzing the evidence, the Learned Judicial Magistrate(FC), Ambah, convicted the Appellants under Sections 294, 323 and 326 read with 34 IPC with a maximum sentence of three years under Section 326 read with 34 IPC.

xxx xxx xxx

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 predominantly 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. and Laxmi Narayan (Supra).

xxx xxx xxx

19. We thus sumup 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.”

A perusal of the above said judgment would show that it has been held that the extra ordinary power enjoined upon a High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of Section 320 Cr.P.C. It has further been observed that criminal proceedings involving non heinous offences can be annulled irrespective of the fact that trial has already been concluded and appeal stands dismissed against conviction and that handing out punishment is not the sole form of delivering justice. Thus, it goes without saying, that in 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.

Coordinate Bench of this Court in ***Ram Parkash's*** case(*supra*), has allowed a petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. under similar circumstances. The relevant portion of the said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:

“Prayer in this petition filed under Section 482 Cr.PC is for quashing of the FIR No.225, dated 24.08.2005 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 323, 324, 452, 506, 148 and 149 IPC(subsequently added Section 308 and 336 IPC), registered at Police Station Sadar

Nawanshahar, District-Nawanshahar, on the basis of compromise dated 06.02.2015(Annexure P-4) and all other subsequent proceedings arising therefrom including the judgment of conviction and order of sentence, both dated 25.09.2013 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, whereby the accused-petitioners, were convicted and sentenced...

xxx—xxx--xxx

Quashing of the aforesaid FIR and setting aside of the impugned judgment and order of sentence dated 25.09.2013 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, is sought on the basis of compromise dated 06.02.2015 (Annexure P-4), entered into between the parties during the pendency of the appeal before this Court.

xxx--xxx--xxx

*This Court in the case of **Sube Singh and another Versus State of Haryana and another 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102** has considered the compounding of offences at the appellate stage and has observed that even when appeal against the conviction is pending before the Sessions Court and parties entered into a compromise, the High Court is vested unparallel power under Section 482 Cr.PC to quash criminal proceedings at any stage so as to secure the ends of justice and has observed as under:-*

“15. The refusal to invoke power under Section 320 CrPC, however, does not debar the High Court from resorting to its inherent power under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code and pass an appropriate order so as to secure the ends of justice.

16. As regards the doubt expressed by the learned Single Judge whether the inherent power under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code to quash the criminal proceedings on the basis of compromise entered into between the parties can be invoked even if the accused has been held guilty and convicted by the trial Court, we find that in **Dr. Arvind Barsaul etc. v. State of Madhya Pradesh & Anr., 2008(2) R.C.R. (Criminal) 910 : (2008)5 SCC 794**, the unfortunate matrimonial dispute was settled after the appellant (husband) had been convicted under Section 498A Indian Penal Code and sentenced to 18 months' imprisonment and his appeal was pending before the first appellate court. The Apex Court quashed the criminal proceedings keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case and in the interest of justice observing that "continuation of criminal proceedings would be an abuse of the process of law" and also by invoking its power under Article 142 of the Constitution. Since the High Court does not possess any power akin to the one under Article 142 of the Constitution, the cited decision cannot be construed to have vested the High Court with such like unparallel power.

17. The magnitude of inherent jurisdiction exercisable by the High Court under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code with a view to prevent the abuse of law or to secure the ends of justice, however, is wide enough to include its power to quash the proceedings in relation to not only the non compoundable offences notwithstanding the

bar under Section 320 Criminal Procedure Code but such a power, in our considered view, is exercisable at any stage save that there is no express bar and invoking of such power is fully justified on facts and circumstances of the case.

18. xxx xxx

19. xxx xxx

20. xxx xxx

21. In the light of these peculiar facts and circumstances where not only the parties but their close relatives (including daughter and son-in-law of respondent No.2) have also supported the amicable settlement, we are of the considered view that the negation of the compromise would disharmonize the relationship and cause a permanent rift amongst the family members who are living together as a joint family. Non-acceptance of the compromise would also lead to denial of complete justice which is the very essence of our justice delivery system. Since there is no statutory embargo against invoking of power under Section 482 Criminal Procedure Code after conviction of an accused by the trial Court and during pendency of appeal against such conviction, it appears to be a fit case to invoke the inherent jurisdiction and strike down the proceedings subject to certain safeguards.

22. Consequently and for the reasons afore-stated, we allow this petition and set aside the judgement and order dated 16.03.2009 passed in Criminal Case No. 425-1 of 2000 of Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Hisar, on the basis of compromise dated 08.08.2011 arrived at between

them and their step-mother respondent No.2 (Smt. Reshma Devi) w/o late Rajmal qua the petitioners only. As a necessary corollary, the criminal complaint filed by respondent No.2 is dismissed qua the petitioners on the basis of above-stated compromise. Resultantly, the appeal preferred by the petitioners against the above-mentioned order dated 16.03.2009 would be rendered infructuous and shall be sodeclared by the first Appellate Court at Hisar.”

*Similarly, in the case of **Baghel Singh Versus State of Punjab 2014(3) RCR (Criminal) 578**, whereby the accused was convicted under Section 326 IPC and was sentenced to undergo rigorous imprisonment for two years, the parties entered into compromise during the pendency of the appeal. This Court while relying upon the judgment of **Lal Chand Versus State of Haryana, 2009 (5) RCR (Criminal) 838** and **Chhota Singh Versus State of Punjab 1997(2) RCR (Criminal) 392** allowed the compounding of offence in respect of offence under Section 326 IPC at the appellate stage with the observation that it will be a starting point in maintaining peace between the parties, such offence can be compounded.*

xxx—xxx--xxx

Accordingly, FIR No.225, dated 24.08.2005 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 323, 324, 452, 506, 148 and 149 IPC(subsequently added Section 308 and 336 IPC), registered at Police Station Sadar Nawanshahar, District-Nawanshahar and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, qua the accused petitioners, are quashed, on the basis of compromise dated 06.02.2015 (Annexure P-4), subject to payment of costs of

Rs.25,000/-, to be deposited with the Punjab State Legal Services Authority, Chandigarh.

Consequently, the judgment of conviction and order of sentence, both dated 25.09.2013 passed by the learned Addl. Sessions Judge, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar, are set aside subject to payment of cost.”

Another Coordinate Bench of this Court in a judgment dated 09.03.2017 passed in CRR no.390 of 2017 titled as **“Kuldeep Singh vs. Vijay Kumar and another”** has held as under:-

*“Reliance can be placed on **Kaushalya Devi Massand vs. Roopkishore Khore, 2011 (2) RCR (Criminal) 298 and Damodar S. Prabhu vs. Sayed Babalal, AIR 2010 (SC) 1097.** The revisional jurisdiction of the High Court in terms of Section 401 Cr.P.C. would result in bringing about ends of justice between the parties in the event of finding that the compromise is genuine, bonafide and free from any undue influence.*

The compromise in question would serve as a everlasting tool in favour of the parties for which indulgence can be given by this Court. The revisional exercise would also be in consonance with the spirit of Section 147 of Negotiable Instruments Act.

*The principle as laid down in **Damodar S. Prabhu vs. Sayed Babalal, AIR 2010 (SC) 1097,** would be squarely fortified if the compromise in question is allowed to be effected between the parties with leave of the Court.*

In view of aforesaid, impugned judgment dated 19.01.2017 passed by Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib vide which conviction and sentence of the

petitioner was upheld stands quashed.

*The revision petition is allowed subject to deposit of 15% of the cheque amount as per ratio laid down in **Damodar S. Prabhu's case (supra)** to State Legal Services Authority, failing which this order will be of no consequence. Necessary consequences to follow.”*

Reliance in the above said judgment was also placed upon the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Damodar S. Prabhu's case (supra)** and thus, as per settled law, this Court has the power to set aside the judgment of conviction against the petitioner on the basis of a valid compromise. The compromise in the present case is genuine and valid.

Keeping in view the law laid down in the above said judgment, more so the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in **Ramgopal & Anr's case (supra)**, the relevant parameters for consideration as laid down by the said judgment, would be considered by this Court. Firstly, in the present case, it is admitted case of the parties that no injury has been caused to any person. Secondly, compromise has been entered into without any coercion, or compulsion and it has been entered into willingly and the said fact has been endorsed by virtue of the report submitted by District and Sessions Judge, Gurugram. Thirdly, the incident is of the year 2021 and there is nothing to show that any untoward incident has taken place after the same, between the parties. The appellant as well as the complainant belong to State of West Bengal and, thus, the said compromise will help in bringing peace and harmony between the parties. Fourthly, the offence, in the present case, cannot be stated to be a heinous offence or offence of a serious nature and fifthly, the object of administration of the criminal justice system

would remain unaffected on acceptance of the said amicable settlement between the parties and /or resultant acquittal of the appellant

Thus, keeping in view the above said facts and circumstances, the main appeal is allowed as well as the present application bearing No.CRM-38343-2022 is allowed and FIR No.52 dated 08.02.2021 registered under Sections 379-A/34 of IPC at Sector 50, Gurugram as well as all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed and judgment of conviction dated 10.08.2022 and also order of sentence dated 12.08.2022 passed by the Sessions Judge, Gurugram, are set aside.

Since, the main case has been decided, application bearing CRM-39700-2022 for suspension of sentence of applicant-appellant is rendered infructuous and is disposed of as such.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, shall stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid judgment.

08.12.2022

Pawan

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:-

Yes/No

Whether reportable:-

Yes/No