

249

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

CRM-M-43372-2022

Date of decision : 20.12.2022

MANJEET KUMAR AND OTHERS

....Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Narinder S. Lucky, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jaiteshwar S. Bhandari, Asstt. Advocate General, Punjab
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.329, dated 18.12.2015 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 325, 323, 341, 506, 148 and 149 of the IPC at Police Station City Phagwara, District Kapurthala, (Annexure P-1) on the basis of compromise.

2. On 19.09.2022, 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.329 dated 18.12.2015, registered for offences punishable under Sections 325, 323, 341,

506, 148 and 149 of the Indian Penal Code, at Police Station City Phagwara, District Kapurthala and all consequential proceedings arising there-from qua the petitioners in view of the compromise dated 17.08.2022 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the matter already stands compromised vide compromise dated 17.08.2022 (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion returnable for 20.12.2022.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Gurdarshan Singh Sidhu, Asstt. A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1- State. Mr. Navjit Singh, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 & 3 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 respondents No.2 & 3 are directed to appear before learned Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court on 30.09.2022. 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 Illaq Magistrate/trial Court shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from SDJM, Phagwara dated 21.11.2022 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“Hence, in view of the statement suffered by the parties and the Investigating Officer, the requisite information as desired by the Hon'ble High Court is as under:

1. There are total six accused arrayed in the present FIR namely Jarnail Kumar, Majit Kumar, Sunita, Sukhwinder Kaur, Saudagar and Poonam. Out of the above six accused, five appeared and make the statement qua compromise.
2. As per statement of I.O. Inspector Hardev Preet Singh, accused Jarnail Kumar has died and was proclaimed person in this case.
3. The compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion and undue influence.
4. Accused Manjit Kumar is also involved in other FIR No.2/2016 U/s 341, 323, 506 IPC, P.S. City, Phagwara.
5. As per the statement of I.O., there is one complainant Naresh Kumar and one victim Ruby d/o Jarnail Kumar in the above mentioned FIR.”

4. Ld. Counsel appearing for respondents No.2 and 3 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.

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

6. I have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and have carefully

gone through the records of the case.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.329, dated 18.12.2015 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 325, 323, 341, 506, 148 and 149 of the IPC at Police Station City Phagwara, District

Kapurthala, (Annexure P-1) and all proceedings arising therefrom, are,
hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

December 20, 2022
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

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