

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

248

**CRM-M-39165-2019
Date of Decision : 01.11.2022**

Subodh Mandal

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present : None.

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA, J. (ORAL)

Lawyers are abstaining from work today.

The petitioner has filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.95 dated 12.07.2019 registered under Sections 465, 467, 468 and 471 of the I.P.C. at Police Station Navi Baradari, Jalandhar (**Annexure P-1**) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 17.07.2019 (**Annexures P-2**) effected between the private parties.

Pursuant to order dated 16.01.2020 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, report dated 09.03.2020 was received from learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Jalandhar. Perusal of said report shows that the private parties except respondent No.3-Ved Parkash had recorded their statements regarding compromise. Vide order dated 13.09.2022 respondent No.3-Ved Parkash was again directed to appear before the trial Court for recording his statement.

Now, learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Jalandhar has submitted report dated 19.10.2022 along with statement of respondent No.3-Ved Parkash which is taken on record.

It is now well settled that the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings in non-compoundable cases on the basis of settlement between the parties for securing the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process where the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case.

Criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character particularly those arising out of commercial transaction or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family dispute can be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire dispute among themselves. However, such power cannot be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape dacoity, etc. which are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, prosecution for offences alleged to have been committed under special enactments like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servant while working in that capacity cannot be quashed on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender. For judicial precedents in this regard, reference may be made to *Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another : 2012(4) RCR Criminal) 543*, *Narinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab (Supreme Court) : 2014 (2) RCR (Criminal) 482*, *State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (Supreme Court) : 2019 (2) RCR (Criminal) 255* and *Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others (Punjab and Haryana High Court) : 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*.

According to the reports, learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Jalandhar is satisfied that compromise effected between the parties is genuine, outcome of free consent of the parties and is without coercion from any quarter.

Considering the reports dated 09.03.2020 and 19.10.2022 of learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Jalandhar and the fact that the compromise will bring peace and harmony between the parties, aforesaid FIR No.95 dated 12.07.2019 (**Annexure P-1**) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed, qua the petitioner only.

Disposed of, accordingly.

(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE

01.11.2022
Kothiyal

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