

CRM-M-46211-2021

Reserved on: 23.11.2021

Pronounced on : 05.01.2022

Mamata Sharma and another

.....Petitioners

Vs.

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP CHITKARA

Present: Mr. Mohan Singh Rana, Advocate for the petitioners.

 Mr. Sidakmeet Singh Sandhu, AAG, Punjab.

 Mr. Ravi Malik, Advocate for respondent No.2.

ANOOP CHITKARA J.

FIR No.	Dated	Police Station	Sections
245	30.06.2020	Civil Lines Batala, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur (Punjab)	420 IPC

The petitioners, who have been arraigned as accused in the above captioned FIR, have come up before this Court under Section 482 CrPC to quash the FIR and all consequential proceedings based on the compromise with the victims.

2. The gist of the allegations against the petitioner(s) is that the complainant (respondent No.2) sent a written complaint dated 16.08.2020 to SSP, Batala in the following terms:-

She stated that some persons allured her that Mamata Sharma (petitioner No.1) is an influential lady working in Haryana Police Chandigarh and she can help her to get job for her son. She further came to know about one Lakhwinder Singh (petitioner

No.2) and she was told that that these persons can get a government job for her son Subhash. In lieu of government job, they demanded Rs.7 lacs. Subsequently it was informed that medical is required for job. Later on a letter was received at our home in which it was mentioned that Subhash has been appointed as BPO at Human Rights Commission on a contract of two years. Subhash worked there for two months but after holidays when he reached there to join he found that there was no office. Thereafter, when the complainant asked to return her money they threatened her. Based on such complaint, above captioned FIR was registered by the police.

3. During the pendency of the petition, the accused and the injured have compromised the matter, and its copy is annexed with this petition as **Annexure P-2**. After that, the petitioners have come up before this Court to quash the FIR, and in the quashing petition, the injured have been impleaded as respondent(s).

4. On the prayer of the parties, the Court had permitted the parties to appear before the concerned Court to record their statements. As per the concerned Sessions Court's report, the victim(s), without any threat, consented to the quashing of FIR and consequent proceedings.

ANALYSIS & REASONING:

5. As per report received from JMIC, Batala, statement of the complainant and other parties, have been recorded and the complainant has no objection if the present FIR is quashed. It is mentioned in the report that compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion and undue influence.

6. The following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition: -

- a) The accused and the private respondent(s) have amicably settled the matter between them in terms of the compromise deed and the statements recorded before the concerned Court;
- b) A perusal of the documents reveal that the settlement has not been secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means;
- c) The victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings;
- d) There is no objection from the private respondents in case present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed;
- e) In the given facts, the occurrence does not affect public peace or tranquillity, moral turpitude or harm the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy;

- f) The rejection of compromise may also lead to ill will. The pendency of trial affects career and happiness;
- g) There is nothing on the record to prima facie consider the accused as an unscrupulous, habitual, or professional offender;
- h) The purpose of criminal jurisprudence is reformatory in nature and to work to bring peace to family and society;
- i) The ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power by quashing the FIR and the consequent proceedings.

7. In the present case, the offence under S. 420 IPC is compoundable under Section 320 CrPC. Given the legislative mandate, the prosecution can be closed by quashing the FIR and consequent proceedings.

8. In Shakuntala Sawhney v 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.

9. In Himachal Pradesh Cricket Association v State of Himachal Pradesh, 2018 (4) Crimes 324, Hon'ble Supreme Court holds "[47]. As far as Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 135 of 2017 is concerned, the appellants came to this Court challenging the order of cognizance only because of the reason that matter was already pending as the appellants had filed the Special Leave Petitions against the order of the High Court rejecting their petition for quashing of the FIR/Chargesheet. Having regard to these peculiar facts, writ petition has also been entertained. In any case, once we hold that FIR needs to be quashed, order of cognizance would automatically stands vitiated."

10. In the facts and circumstances peculiar to this case, the petition is allowed in the aforementioned terms. The FIR and other proceedings captioned above, with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the present petitioners. The bail bonds of the petitioners are accordingly discharged. All pending application(s), if any, stand closed.

(ANOOP CHITKARA)

JUDGE

05.01.2022/anju rani

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes

Whether reportable: No