

IN THE HIGH COURT AT CALCUTTA

Circuit Bench at Jalpaiguri

(Criminal Revisional Jurisdiction)

APPELLATE SIDE

Present:

The Hon'ble Justice Shampa Dutt (Paul)

CRR 166 of 2023

With

CRAN 1 of 2023

Samrat Guha @ Rony Guha

Vs.

The State of West Bengal & Anr.

For the Petitioner : Mr. Arnab Saha.

For the State : Mr. Aditi Shankar Chakraborty,
: Mr. Aniruddha Biswas.

For the De facto Complainant : Mr. Sourav Ganguly,
Mr. Sudhindra Das.

Hearing concluded on : 12.10.2023

Judgment on : 13.10.2023

Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.:

1. The present revision has been preferred praying for quashing of impugned criminal proceeding being General Register No. 3923 of 2017 arising out of Kotwali Police Station Case No. 610 of 2017 dated 16.09.2017 under Sections 341/324/307 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, currently pending disposal before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate at Jalpaiguri.
2. Now the parties have jointly filed a **joint petition of compromise** stating that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties. The opposite party/de facto complainant is also the injured in the present case. The said complainant/injured has specifically submitted that he has no objection if the present proceedings is quashed against the petitioner in the revisional application.
3. The State has placed the case diary.
4. On perusal of the materials in the case diary and the medical papers therein at page 22, it appears that the Doctor prima facie found the injury to be simple in nature. Though history was given to the Doctor as 'physical assault', the petitioner has not been named in the injury report.
5. Considering the said materials in the case diary and on record there is no impediment to quash the proceedings on prayer of the complainant injured by invoking this Court's inherent power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C.

6. A Three Judge Bench of the Court in **(2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases, 303, Gian Singh vs State of Punjab** and another has cleared the position in respect of the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceedings in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction in para 61 of the judgment, which is reproduced herein:-

“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. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having

overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, 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 despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

**7. *In Anita Maria Dias & Anr. vs The State of Maharashtra & Anr.*
(2018) 3 SCC 290.**

The Court held:-

- (a) *Offences which are predominant of civil character, commercial transaction should be quashed when parties have resolved their dispute.*
- (b) *Timing of settlement would be crucial for exercise of power or declining to exercise power (stage of proceedings).*

8. **The joint application filed by the parties clearly shows that an amicable settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the parties** and the complainant does not wish to proceed with the General Register No. 3923 of 2017 arising out of Kotwali Police Station Case No. 610 of 2017 dated 16.09.2017 under Sections 341/324/307 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, currently pending disposal before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate at Jalpaiguri in respect of the petitioner namely Samrat Guha @ Rony Guha.
9. **From the materials on record,** it is clear that dispute in the present case is private in nature and the parties have now resolved their entire dispute by way of a compromise/settlement on affidavit and as such 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 could be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the complainant. (As in the words of the Supreme Court in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another**).

10. As such this Court is of the view that it would be unfair and contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings which would tantamount to abuse of process of law in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties in respect of their dispute and to secure the ends of justice it would be prudent to quash the proceedings in the case as prayed for.
11. **Accordingly, the revisional application being CRR 166 of 2023 is allowed.**
12. The proceeding being General Register No. 3923 of 2017 arising out of Kotwali Police Station Case No. 610 of 2017 dated 16.09.2017 under Sections 341/324/307 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, currently pending disposal before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate at Jalpaiguri **is hereby quashed** in respect of the petitioner namely Samrat Guha @ Rony Guha.
13. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.
14. All connected applications, if any, stand disposed of.
15. Copy of this judgment be sent to the learned Trial Court for necessary compliance.
16. Urgent certified website copy of this judgment, if applied for, be supplied expeditiously after complying with all, necessary legal formalities.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)