

312

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

CRM-M-50893-2022

Date of decision : 17.11.2022

Ravisher Singh Malhi

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS BAHL

Present: Mr. Sourabh Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Iqbal S. Mann, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. S.K. Kanojia, Advocate for respondent No.2.

VIKAS BAHL, J. (ORAL)

This is the second petition under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.184 dated 19.11.2019 registered under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Cantonment, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

On 04.11.2022, this Court had passed the following order:-

“Today, the Lawyers have decided to abstain from appearing in the Court because of the call given by the Bar Association.

This is a second petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

praying for quashing of FIR No.184 dated 19.11.2019 registered under Section 420 IPC and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act 2014 at Police Station Cantonment, District Police Commissionerate Amritsar and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

Petitioner no.1 as well as complainant-respondent no.1 have appeared in person and they have jointly stated that the matter has been compromised and further stated that they are ready to make statements in support of the compromise within a period of 12 days before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court.

Notice of motion for 17.11.2022.

The parties are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements qua compromise within a period of 12 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 abovesaid order, a report has been submitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Amritsar (Duty). The relevant portion of the said report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“I am satisfied that compromise is genuine and has been

effected between the parties voluntarily, without any coercion or undue influence. It is further submitted that as per the statement of investigating officer ASI Ravinder Kumar No.1384 Police Station Cantonment, Amritsar, he is the investigating officer of the present case. He further stated that FIR was registered by Mhonder Chopra @ Mahinder Chopra complainant against accused Ravisher Singh @ Malhi. Except this accused, no other accused is involved in the present case FIR. No person has been declared as proclaimed person in the present FIR. There is one another FIR No.106 dated 20.6.2018 under Section-354, 380 of IPC Police Station B Division, Amritsar and except two FIR, the accused is not involved in any other case. In this case, challan not presented in this case till today. There is only one victim namely Mohinder Chopra @ Mahinder Chopra complainant in this case.”

A perusal of the said report would show that the compromise has been found to be genuine, without any pressure or undue influence. 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 petitioner has submitted that the petitioner was not declared proclaimed offender in the present case. Learned counsel for the State, as per instructions has stated that the said 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, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioner 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**”, reported as **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**”, reported as **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.184 dated 19.11.2019 registered under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 13 of the Punjab Travel Professionals (Regulation) Act, 2014 at Police Station Cantonment, District Police Commissionerate, Amritsar and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise, are ordered to be quashed, qua the petitioner.

All the pending miscellaneous applications, if any, stand disposed of in view of the abovesaid judgment.

17.11.2022

Pawan

**(VIKAS BAHL)
JUDGE**

Whether speaking/reasoned:- Yes/No

Whether reportable:- Yes/No