

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

281

CRM-M-54138-2022
Decided on : 12.12.2022

Satish and others

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

PRESENT: Mr. Sachin Mittal, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jai Singh Yadav, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 788 dated 06.12.2016 under Sections 323, 324, 34 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Sector-140, Gurugram (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising on the basis of the compromise.

On 21.11.2022, this Court was pleased to pass the following order:-

“This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.788 dated 06.12.2016, registered under Sections 323, 324, 34 and 506 IPC, at Police Station Sector 10, Gurugram and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

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

Notice of motion for 12.12.2022.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Praveen Bhadu, AAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Jai Singh Yadav, Advocate, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and admits the factum of compromise.

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

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. ”*

In pursuance of the said order, a report has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gurugram to the Registrar General of this Court. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“In the present case, there is only one complainant (as per the full and report of 10) details of whom are as follows:

Rekha wife of Satish Kumar. R/o House No 502, Street No 2. Bhawani Gurgaon, Haryana-122001

In the present case, as per the challan and

as per report of 101 there are three accused persons facing trial before the court and named in the FIR, details of whom are as follows:-

- 1. Satish Kumar son of Ramphal (husband)*
- 2. Ramphal son of Banwari Lal (father-in-law)*
- 3. Shakuntala Devi wife of Ramphal (mother-in-law). It is further submitted in the 10 report. none of the accused is proclaimed person. And case bearing FIR No.09 dated 22.01.2017 under Sections 323, 406, 498A and 506 IPC PS Women West. Gurugram is registered against accused Satish.*

In view of the statements of the interested parties. I am satisfied that, they have compromised the matter amongst themselves without any fear or pressure and that the compromise has been voluntarily arrived at between them.”

A perusal of the above report would show that it has been stated that the statements of the complainant as well as the petitioners have been recorded in the case and they have stated that the matter has been compromised and they have no objection in case the FIR is quashed. It is further stated that the statement of the complainant has been made voluntarily without any fear, coercion or pressure.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has further submitted that none of the petitioners were declared proclaimed offenders in the present case.

Learned counsel for the State, as per instructions, has stated

that the abovesaid fact is correct.

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 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 as well reply submitted on behalf of the State, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners and the complainant and the present FIR having been compromised deserves to be quashed. 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. XXX---XXX”

In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 788 dated 06.12.2016 under Sections 323, 324, 34 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Sector-140, Gurugram (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising on the basis of the compromise, are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.

12.12.2022

Mehak

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No