

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

CRM-M-49853-2019

Date of decision : 14.11.2022

Lovepreet Singh and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Nagar Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. S.S. Cheema, DAG, Punjab
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Vikasdeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of DDR No.44 dated 14.09.2019 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 324, 148, 149, 506 IPC arising out of FIR No.264 dated 14.09.2019 for offences punishable under Sections 323, 324, 148, 149, 506 IPC, at Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala (Annexure P-1) on the basis of compromise.

2. At the outset, counsel for the petitioners points out that inadvertently in the headnote as well as in the body of the petition, while mentioning sections in FIR, Section 324 IPC has been written instead of Section 341 IPC and in the Power of Attorney filed along with the petition,

Mr. Vikasdeep Singh's name has been wrongly mentioned instead of his name, who is actually representing complainant/respondent No.2 in present case and petitioners in connected case i.e. CRM-M-49890-2019.

3. On oral request made by counsel for the petitioners, the same is ordered to be corrected. Registry to carry out the necessary correction.

4. Ld. Counsel for the petitioners is also permitted to rectify the error that has crept in the custody certificate.

5. On 25.11.2019, the following order was passed :-

“By invoking Section 482 Cr.P.C., the petitioners have prayed for quashing of DDR No.44 dated 14.09.2019 under Sections 323, 324, 148, 149, 506 IPC arising out of FIR No.264 dated 14.09.2019 for offence punishable under Sections 323, 341, 148, 149, 506 IPC (Section 324 IPC wrongly mentioned in the prayer clause of the petition instead of Section 341 IPC), registered with Police Station City Kapurthala, District Kapurthala and proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.

Notice of motion for 21.04.2020.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 – State while Mr. Vikasdeep Singh, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No.2.

Counsel for the petitioners is directed to supply copy of the paperbook to counsel opposite during course of the day.

The parties are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements qua compromise within a period of 30 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. ”*

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from CJM, Kapurthala dated 03.01.2020 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

- “5. So in this way, on the basis of the statements made by both the parties it has become crystal clear that :
- a) Five person arrayed as accused in FIR.
 - b) No accused has been declared proclaimed offender in the said case.
 - c) The compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.
 - d) Accused in the said case are not involved in any other FIR.
 - e) There is only one victim/injured in this case.”

7. Ld. Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 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.

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

9. I have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

10. 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.

11. 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.

12. Consequently, the petition is allowed. DDR No.44 dated

14.09.2019 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 324, 148, 149, 506 IPC arising out of FIR No.264 dated 14.09.2019 for offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 148, 149, 506 IPC and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

November 14, 2022
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

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