

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

\*\*\*\*

**CRM-M-40462-2022  
Date of Decision: 18.11.2022**

Sukhraj Singh and others

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER**

Present: Mr. Amit Gupta, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Harjinder Singh, AAG, Punjab  
for respondent No.1/State.

Mr. Vaneet Mittal, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*\*

**HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)**

This petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.7 dated 07.01.2021 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 379-B, 323 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar, Mohali, Punjab and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 02.07.2022 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Vide order dated 07.09.2022, the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the

genuineness and validity of the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, SAS Nagar, has submitted a consolidated report, vide letter dated 14.11.2022, which indicates that the parties appeared before the Magistrate and got recorded their respective statements with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the report, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure or coercion from any corner. Relevant extract of the said report is reproduced as under:

“ - x - x - x -

*By considering the statements of complainant Chander Shekhar, accused Sukhraj Singh, Tarjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh @ Kaka and investigating officer ASI Amrik Singh, the requisite point wise report is as under:*

*(i) Total four accused namely Sukhraj Singh, Tarjot Singh, Gurpreet Singh and Jai Parkash as mentioned above are arrayed as accused in the case;*

*(ii) The sole complainant/victim Chander Shekhar and three accused namely Sukhraj Singh, Tarjot Singh and Gurpreet Singh are party to the compromise, whereas the another accused namely Jai Parkash is not party to the compromise;*

*(iii) The accused have not been declared as a proclaimed offender nor any such proceedings have been initiated or pending decision;*

*(iv) The present case is pending at the stage of investigation.*

- x - x - x -”

A perusal of the aforesaid report would show that one Jai

Parkash (accused) is not a party to the compromise and neither he had

appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, SAS Nagar, for getting his statement recorded with regard to the compromise in question. However, respondent No.2/complainant, namely Chander Shekhar s/o Babu Ram, who is present in the Court, as identified by Mr. Vaneet Mittal, Advocate, representing respondent No.2, has stated that said Jai Parkash has virtually no role to play in the commission of alleged offences and he has rather left the country for earning his livelihood at Dubai. Respondent No.2 has further stated that he has no grievance against said Jai Parkash and he has no objection if FIR No.7 dated 07.01.2021 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 379-B, 323 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar, Mohali, Punjab, would be quashed against all the accused, including Jai Parkash.

Further, a perusal of the aforesaid report would also show that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the case, who have stated that the matter has been compromised and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. They have further stated that the said compromise arrived at between them is genuine, voluntary and without any pressure.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has again reiterated that the matter has been settled and the said compromise is in the interest of all the persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the parties.

I have heard the learned counsel for the parties and perused the file.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in "**Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab**", 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, it

is held that High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973, to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution where the High Court is of the opinion that the same is required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice.

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of “**Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another**”, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543 has held as under:-

*“57. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R. may be exercised where the offender and victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity etc;*

*cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominantly civil flavour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personnel in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”*

**In “*Shakuntala Sawhney Vs. Kaushalya Sawhney*”, 1979 (3)**

***SCR 639, at P 642***, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the finest hour of Justice arises propitiously when parties, who fell apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.

Considering the entire facts, compromise arrived at between the parties, statements of the parties recorded before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and report dated 14.11.2022, submitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, SAS Nagar, and also the statement made by respondent No.2/complainant (Chander Shekhar) in Court today, since the parties have arrived at a compromise by amicably settling their disputes and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose will be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Further, in the light of the abovementioned judicial precedents, when the parties have entered into a compromise then continuation of the proceedings would be mere an abuse of process of the Court.

In order to prevent unnecessary continuation of criminal proceedings on the ground that there are bleak chances of conviction in the case, I am of the considered view that it would be in fitness of things to quash the proceedings on the basis of compromise and by quashing the FIR while accepting the prayer of the petitioners, would be securing the ends of justice.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.7 dated 07.01.2021 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 379-B, 323 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, registered at Police Station Sohana, District SAS Nagar, Mohali, Punjab and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed. However, the same would be subject to payment of costs of Rs.5,000/- to be deposited by the petitioners with the **“Poor Patients' Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh”** and the said amount would be spent for the treatment of poor patients within the knowledge of its Medical Superintendent.

Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements made in the Court below.

All pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

**18.11.2022**

*Apurva*

**(HARSH BUNGER)  
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No