

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

287

CRM-M-564-2023

Date of decision : 16.10.2023

Gurkirat Singh**..... Petitioner****versus****State of Punjab and another****..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. Ajay Pal Singh Rehan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hittan Nehra, Addl. A.G., Punjab
assisted by ASI Sukhwinder Singh.

Mr. N.K. Awasthi, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Godara, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.118 dated 07.11.2022, registered for the offence punishable under Section 379-B of IPC (Section 411 of IPC added subsequently) at Police Station Sekhwan, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 16.12.2022 (Annexure P-2)

2. On 03.08.2023, the following order was passed:-

“The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.118 dated 07.11.2022 (Annexure P-1) registered for the offences punishable under Section 379-B of Indian Penal Code (Section 411 of IPC added subsequently) at Police Station Sekhwan, Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur and all subsequent proceedings

2023:PHHC:146677

arising thereto on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter already stands compromised vide compromise deed dated 16.12.2022 (Annexure P-2).

In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 23.08.2023.

On their doing so, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall record their statements and furnish its report to this Court by the next date of hearing on the following aspects:-

1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR.
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 case 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.

A copy of the report be also sent to the Registrar Judicial of this Court.

Needless to say that in case for any reason the statements are not recorded on the aforesaid date, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter.

To come up on 16.10.2023 .”

2023:PHHC:146677

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from JMIC, Batala dated 07.10.2023 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“xx xx xx

1. As per the statement of the parties and IO concerned, there are four persons arraigned in the present case namely 1. Karanbir Singh @ Karani S/o Jaswinder Singh @ Sonu R/o Village Kartar Nagar, Batala. 2. Gurkirat Singh @ Kirat S/o Gurmukh Singh R/o Uttam Nagar, Batala, 3. Jashanpreet Singh @ Jashan S/o Jasbir Singh R/o Basrawan, 4. Karanpreet @ Githa S/o Jaspinder Singh R/o Aulakh Kalan.

2. As per the statement of IO, none of the above stated accused have been declared as Proclaimed offender.

3. As per the statement of IO, none of the above stated accused are involved in any other case.

4. As per the statement of IO, there is only one victim/complainant namely Baldev Raj S/o Dult Ram @ Daulat Ram in the present case.

5. After considering the statements of both the parties and that of the IO, this Court is of the view that the compromise between complainant Baldev Raj and accused Gurkirat Singh is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.”

4. The aforesaid report reveals that there are four accused persons namely Karanbir Singh @ Karani, Gurkirat Singh @ Kirat, Jashanpreet Singh @ Jashan and Karanpreet @ Githa. However, the compromise has only been effected with accused-petitioner Gurkirat Singh.

2023:PHHC:146677

5. Mr. N.K. Awasthi, Advocate for Mr. Sandeep Godara, Advocate appears for respondent No.2 and 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 petitioner are quashed.

6. Similarly learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

8. 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

2023:PHHC:146677

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.

9. 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

2023:PHHC:146677

said to be voluntary in its nature.

- (v) Complainant/victim has entered into compromise on his own volition.

10. Since the parties are *ad idem* that the compromise/settlement has to be read strictly *inter se* between the parties to the present petition and the complainant wants to pursue prosecution of rest of accused, namely, Karanbir Singh @ Karani, Jashanpreet Singh @ Jashan and Karanpreet @ Githa and it is only Gurkirat Singh who has approached this Court by way of present petition, the present petition is being entertained and allowed qua Gurkirat Singh only.

11. The question raised by State counsel as to whether the FIR can be quashed in part or not already stands answered by Apex Court in '**Lovely Salhotra and another vs. State (NCT of Delhi)**' reported as **(2018) 12 SCC 391**, wherein it was observed as under:-

“xx xx xx

We have taken into account the facts of the matter in question as it appears to us that no cognizable offence is made out against the appellants – herein. The High Court was wrong in holding that the F.I.R. cannot be quashed in part and it ought to have appreciated the fact that the appellants - herein cannot be allowed to suffer on the basis of the complaint filed by Respondent No.2 – herein only on the ground that the investigation against co-accused is still pending. It is pertinent to note that the learned Magistrate has opined that no offence is made out against co-accused Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 6 *prima facie*.”

12. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.118 dated 07.11.2022, registered for the offence punishable under Section 379-B of IPC (Section 411 of IPC added subsequently) at Police Station Sekhwan,

2023:PHHC:146677

Police District Batala, District Gurdaspur and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

16.10.2023
Dinesh

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No