

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

245

CRM-M-86-2022
Decided on : 17.02.2022

Surinder Kaur and others

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Amandeep Saini, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Karanbir Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gurinder Singh Dhillon, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (Oral)

This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No. 149 dated 20.11.2020 under Sections 169, 270, 427, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 registered at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise.

When the matter came up before this Court on 06.01.2022, the following order was passed:-

“This is a petition filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.149 dated 20.11.2020 registered under Sections 169, 270, 427, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act,

1984, at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 26.11.2021 (Annexure P-2).

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

Notice of motion for 27.01.2022.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Sukhbeer Singh, AAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

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.”*

In pursuance of the said order, a report has been submitted by the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, SBS Nagar to the Registrar General of this Court. The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“Consequently, the report as sought for is as follows:

- 1. As per statement of ASI Manohar Lal, Seven persons have been arrayed as accused in the present case.*

2. *None of the accused has been declared proclaimed offender in the present case.*
3. *Compromise effected between the parties seems to be genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.*
4. *As per statement of ASI Manohar Lal, accused are not indulged in any other FIR.*
5. *As per statement of ASI Manohar Lal, there is no other victim/complainant in the present case except Sukhdeep Singh Kundra, complainant.*

Report is submitted accordingly for kind perusal. The copies of statements made by the complainant and accused, along with their identity proof are enclosed herewith.

Submitted please.”

A perusal of the said report would show that it has been stated that the statements of the complainant as well as the accused have been recorded in the case and both 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 submitted that none of the petitioners were declared proclaimed offender in the present case.

Learned counsel for the State, as per instructions, has stated that these facts are correct.

Mr. Gurinder Singh Dhillon, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No. 2 and has filed power of attorney, same is taken on record. He has reiterated the factum of compromise and has prayed for quashing of FIR on the basis of the same.

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. XXX---XXX”

In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 149 dated 20.11.2020 under Sections 169, 270, 427, 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 registered at Police Station Rahon, District SBS Nagar (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of the compromise, are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioners.

February 17th, 2022

Mehak

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether reasoned/speaking?
Whether reportable?

Yes/No
Yes/No