

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

223

CRM-M-3921-2020
Decided on : 01.06.2023

Madan Lal and others

. . . Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

. . . Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMAN CHAUDHARY

PRESENT: Mr. Madhur Jangra, Advocate for
Mr. Umesh Narang, Advocate
for the petitioners

Mr. H. S. Sullar, Sr. DAG, Punjab

Mr. S. S. Aviraj, Advocate for
Mr. Chander Shekhar, Advocate
for respondent No. 2

AMAN CHAUDHARY, J.

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing FIR No. 101, dated 10.10.2019 registered under Section 304-A and 34 IPC at Police Station Sadar Rajpura, District Patiala, Annexure P-1 and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 22.11.2019, Annexures P-2 and P-3.

2. Learned counsel contends that the death of Rinku Ram had occurred due to electric shock while he was working with the petitioners as a labourer that led to the FIR. In this regard, he relies on the judgment of this Court in the case of **Sikander Yadav and another vs. State of Haryana and others**, CRM-M-55259-2019 dated 24.02.2023.

3. This Court vide order dated 10.05.2023 had directed the parties to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording their statements with regard to the compromise.

4. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 25.05.2023 has been received from the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Rajpura. A perusal of the said report reveals that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded, who have stated that the matter has been settled between the parties and they have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed. The compromise effected between them is genuine, without any undue influence and coercion. It is also stated in the report that there are 3 accused persons. They have not been declared as proclaimed offenders.

5. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case file.

6. The Full Bench of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab**, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052, 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 view that the same was 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.

7. Hon'ble The Supreme Court in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another**, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543, had 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 reads thus:-

“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”

8. This Court in the case of **Sikander Yadav** (supra), wherein also the death had occurred on account of electric shock, while emphasizing the purpose of criminal jurisprudence to be reformatory in nature and bring peace to the family, community and society, thereby, quashed the FIR registered under Section 304-A IPC. The important aspects observed were that the compromise had taken place without any coercion or dubious means and the accused was not an incorrigible or a professional offender.

9. In view of the above-referred judgments and after a perusal of the report of trial Court regarding amicable settlement between the petitioners and the complainant, this Court finds that quashing of FIR will accord a quietus to all disputes between the parties and it is in the best interest of both sides to bury the hatchet and lead a peaceful life. Thus, no useful purpose would be served in continuing the proceedings and in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings in the present case deserve to be quashed.

9. Resultantly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No. 101, dated 10.10.2019 registered under Section 304-A and 34 IPC at Police Station Sadar Rajpura, District Patiala, Annexure P-1 and all other consequential proceedings

arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise and affidavit dated 22.11.2019.

(AMAN CHAUDHARY)
JUDGE

01.06.2023
Mehak

Whether reasoned/speaking?	Yes/No
Whether reportable?	Yes/No