

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANAAT
CHANDIGARH

254

CRM-M-703-2019 (O&M)

Date of decision: 12.09.2023

YADVINDER SINGH

... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARNARESH SINGH GILL

Present:- Ms. Puja Chopra, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Hakam Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Tapish Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARNARESH SINGH GILL, J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.146 dated 24.10.2016, under Section 420 IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Prevention of Human Smuggling Act, 2012, registered at Police Station Patiala, District Patiala, along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 03.01.2019 (Annexure P-2), arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR was registered against the petitioner and his brother, namely, Lakhwinder Singh; that said Lakhwinder Singh was declared innocent; that at the time of registration of the FIR, the petitioner was not in the country and that, at one stage, the petitioner was declared as a proclaimed offender but later on he was arrested and granted bail by the learned Sessions Court, Patiala.

Vide order dated 10.01.2019 passed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate had been directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the genuineness and authenticity of the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Patiala, has submitted a report, vide letter dated 06.03.2019, which indicates that the parties had appeared before the Magistrate and got recorded their respective statements with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the report, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and without any pressure or coercion from any corner.

The Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in case ***Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*** and Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court in case ***Sube Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and another, 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102*** observed that compounding of offence can be allowed even after conviction, during proceedings of the appeal against conviction pending in Sessions Court and in case of involving non-compoundable offence.

The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of ***Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and another. 2012(4) RCR (Criminal) 543*** has held as under:-

“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. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R. may be exercised where the offender and 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 serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like 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 pre-dominantly civil flavour stand on 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 personnel in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put 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 wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

The same view has also been reiterated by Hon'ble the Apex Court in case *Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) RCR (Criminal) 482*.

Since the parties have arrived at a compromise and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose would be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. FIR No.146 dated 24.10.2016, under Section 420 IPC and Section 13 of Punjab Prevention of Human Smuggling Act, 2012, registered at Police Station Patiala, District Patiala, along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioner on the basis of compromise dated 03.01.2019 (Annexure P-2), subject to the petitioner depositing the costs of Rs.20,000/- with the Poor Patients' Welfare Fund, Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research (PGIMER), Chandigarh.

Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements made in the Court below.

12.09.2023

Aman Jain

(HARNARESH SINGH GILL)

JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking?

Yes/No

Whether reportable?

Yes/No