

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-46681-2021

Date of decision: 28.09.2022

Pritpal Singh @ Pappu and others

... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Maninderjit Singh Bedi, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Iqbal S. Mann, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Nidhi Bansal, Advocate for respondents No.2 to 6.

VIKAS BAHL, J.(ORAL)

This is a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.226 dated 25.11.2019 registered under Sections 323,341,506,427,160,148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Division No.2, District Ludhiana, Punjab (Annexure P-1) along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 01.04.2021 (Annexure P-2).

On 08.11.2021, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“This is a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.226 dated 25.11.2019 registered under Sections 323,341,506,427,160,148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Division No.2, District Ludhiana, Punjab (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 01.04.2021 (Annexure P-2).

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that all the persons concerned are party to the compromise.

Notice of motion for 20.01.2022.

On asking of the Court, Mr. N.K. Banka, DAG, Punjab, appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State and Ms. Nidhi Bansal, Advocate appears on behalf of respondent Nos.2 to 6.

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

The Illaqa Magistrate/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.*

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE”

08.11.2021

In pursuance to the said order, a report has been submitted by

Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“On 22.11.2021 ASI Des Raj, No.1612, LDh.PS Div. no.2, Ludhiana has suffered a statement that the present FIR was registered on the statement of complainant Ajmer Singh son of Amrik Singh. However, Gurmail Singh son of Harbhajan Singh, Sanjeev Kumar son of Madan Lal, Prabhjot Singh son of Jailmail Singh, Malkiat Singh @ Rinku son of Dalbir Singh were the witnesses/injured in the above said FIR.

xxxx xxxx

From the statements, it appears that compromise has been voluntarily effected between the parties. The compromise appears to be genuine and without any pressure or coercion.”

Yours faithfully,
(Gurpreet Singh)
Judicial Magistrate 1st Class,
Ludhiana (UID No.PB-406)”

A perusal of the above said report would show that the

petitioners and respondents No.2 to 6 have appeared and suffered statements with respect to the compromise, which have been found to be

voluntary, genuine, and out of free will.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that the petitioners were not declared proclaimed offenders in the present case.

Learned State counsel has stated that he has no objection in case the FIR is quashed on the basis of compromise qua the petitioners.

Learned counsel for respondents No.2 to 6 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 two parties.

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

After perusing the report submitted by the trial Court, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners and the complainant. Since the matter has been settled and the parties have decided to live in peace, this Court feels that in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings deserve to be quashed.

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. 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. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of “***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another***”, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543, had also observed

that in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court, inherent power can be used by this Court to quash criminal proceedings in which a compromise has been effected. The relevant portion of para 57 of the said judgment is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“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 view of what has been discussed hereinabove, this petition is allowed and FIR No.226 dated 25.11.2019 registered under Sections 323,341,506,427,160,148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Division No.2, District Ludhiana, Punjab (Annexure P-1) along with all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.

(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE

28.09.2022

Ishwar

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