

CRM-M-6083-2023 (O&M)

-1-

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

CRM-M-6083-2023 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 10.05.2023

Vijay Kumar

... Petitioner

V/s.

State of Punjab and others

... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present : Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Sunil Agnihotri, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. P. S. Grewal, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Ketan Chopra, Advocate
for respondent No. 2 and 3.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA, J.(Oral)

This instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for the quashing of complaint No. 54/2016 dated 02.06.2016 under Sections 323,325,341,148,149,504,506,120-B IPC (Annexure P-1) and summoning order dated 18.09.2017 (Annexure P-2) whereby the petitioner was summoned under Sections 323, 325, 341, 148, 149, 506 of IPC passed by the JMIC, Mukerian, District Hoshiarpur and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 14.01.2023 (Annexure P-4).

The brief facts of the case are that respondent No. 2 is real uncle (Chacha) of the petitioner, there was a dispute between both the

parties, hence respondent No. 2 filed a complaint, summons were issued but with the intervention of the respectable persons compromise was effected between the parties and finally vide order dated 12.07.2022 all accused mentioned in the complaint except present petitioner were discharged from the offences under which they were summoned in the above mentioned complaint.

This Court after issuance of Notice of motion in the connected matter i.e. CRM-M-6036-2023 had directed the private parties to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court (as the case may be) to get recorded their statements and trial court would satisfy itself about the authenticity of the compromise and the fact that it has been arrived at without any kind of undue influence or pressure, and would thereafter send its report to this Court, before the next date of hearing.

In pursuance of the said order, the report forwarded vide letter No. 420 dated 21.04.2023 has been submitted by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Mukerian which is on record. The relevant part of the report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“ That as per the statement of complainant/respondent No.2, he has filed instant complaint against five accused including accused/petitioner Vijay Kumar and remaining accused persons namely Subhash Chand, son of Dhani Ram, Tripta Devi, wife of Subhash Chand, Sham Lal, son of Balwant Chand and Rekha Rani wife of Sham Lal, all residents of village Palli, PO Bhater, PS Talwara, Tehsil Mukerian, District Hoshiarpur. 2. It is submitted that perusal of complaint file reveals that accused/petitioner was declared a proclaimed person vide

order dated 15.02.2022.

3. In view of the statements recorded of the parties, the undersigned is of the view that compromise between the accused/petitioner and complainant/respondent No. 2 is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or pressure.

4. As per the statement suffered by above-said official ASI Parminderjit Singh, it is report that there is no other case registered against petitioner/accused Vijay Kumar at P.S. Talwara.

5. As per the statement of complainant/respondent No. 2, his wife Smt. Sheela Devi is also one of the victim of this complaint and she has agreed with the compromise effected in between the parties. Further the perusal of file reveals that on appearance of accused/petitioner, the original file has been summoned from the Record Room, Dasua and accused/petitioner Vijay Kumar and complainant/respondent No. 2 Ramesh Lal have got recorded their statements with regard to compromise in compliance of above said order dated 29.03.2023 passed by the Hon'ble High Court and the case is fixed for 20.05.2023 for awaiting further orders from the Hon'ble High Court."

A perusal of the said report would show that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in this case, who have stated that the matter has been compromised and complainant/respondent No.2 has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. They have further stated that the said compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence. Also there is no other case registered against the petitioner, however, he was declared proclaimed person vide order dated 15.02.2022.

Though no reply has been filed by the respondent-State,

however, learned State counsel does not dispute if the complaint in question is quashed on the basis of the compromise effected between the private parties.

Further, as per judgment passed by Sub-Division Judicial Magistrate, Mukerian, dated 12.07.2022, it was found that there is nothing on record to establish the grounds for framing of charges against the accused persons. Moreover, the complainant closed his pre-charge evidence with his own statement. Accordingly, appearing accused persons were discharged from the offences under which they had been summoned in the present case. With regards to the petitioner- Vijay Kumar, file was consigned to judicial record room. Now, as per the report dated 21.04.2023 submitted by SDJM, Mukerian, it has been submitted that the petitioner has put in an appearance and accordingly, original file was summoned from the record room and petitioner/accused Vijay Kumar and complainant/respondent No. 2 have got recorded their statement with regard to compromise in compliance of order dated 29.03.2023 passed by this Court in connected case i.e. CRM-M-6036-2023 (O&M) filed by the petitioner for quashing of P.O. order dated 15.02.2022.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and after perusing the report submitted by the trial Court, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners and the complainant, and by the passage of time, the parties have decided to bury their hatchet and compromise the dispute amicably. Therefore, to prevent the abuse of the process of law and to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings

deserves to be quashed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., which has the magnitude of the inherent jurisdiction of the High Court under it and this Court has the inherent power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. to quash an F.I.R./complaint even when the offences are non-compoundable, with the driving force being the object of securing ends of justice.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **Kulwinder Singh and others Vs State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, it is held that:-

“27. The power to do complete justice is the very essence of every judicial justice dispensation system. It cannot be diluted by distorted perceptions and is not a slave to anything, except to the caution and circumspection, the standards of which the Court sets before it, in the exercise of such plenary and unfettered power inherently vested in it while donning the cloak of compassion to achieve the ends of justice. No embargo, be it in the shape of Section 320(9) of the Criminal Procedure Code, or any other such curtailment, can whittle down the power under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code.

28. The compromise, in modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behavior. It is the soul of justice and if the power under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code is used to enhance such a compromise which, in turn, enhances social amity and reduces friction, then it truly is the "finest hour of justice". Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters,

commercial transactions, and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code in the event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases. There can never be any such rigid rule to prescribe the exercise of such power, especially in the absence of any premonitions to forecast and predict eventualities which the cause of justice may throw up during the course of a litigation.

29. The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Criminal Procedure Code which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Criminal Procedure Code, in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

30. The power under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code is to be exercised Ex-Debitis Justitia to prevent abuse of the process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined parameters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Criminal Procedure Code has no limits and the Court is a vital and extraordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order and play a role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony, and ever-lasting congeniality in society.

Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavor to give full effect to the same unless a such compromise is abhorrent to the lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.”

Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another**, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543, had also observed:-

“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 exercising of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offenses 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 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-dominatingly 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 personal 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 aforesaid quoted percept has also been followed in **State of**

Madhya Pradesh v/s Lakshmi Narayan, (2019)5 SCC 688:-

29. While deciding whether to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Code or not, timings of settlement play a crucial role. Those cases where the settlement is arrived at immediately after the alleged commission of offence and the matter is still under investigation, the High Court may be liberal in accepting the settlement to quash the criminal proceedings/investigation.

The view taken by this Court also finds support from the recent judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in **Ram Gopal & Anr. V/s State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021(4) RCR (Criminal) 322**, relevant of which is as under:-

“19. We thus sum-up and hold that as opposed to Section 320 Cr.P.C., 1973 where the Court is squarely guided by the compromise between the parties in respect of offences ‘compoundable’ within the statutory framework, the extra-ordinary power enjoined upon a High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C., 1973 or vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution, can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of Section 320 Cr.P.C., 1973 Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings, bearing in mind: (i) Nature and effect of the offence on the conscious of the society; (ii) Seriousness of the injury, if any; (iii) Voluntary nature of compromise between the

accused and the victim; & (iv) Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations.”

In view of the report of Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Mukerian, the compromise dated 14.01.2023 (Annexure P-4) and the principles laid down in conspectus of aforesaid judicial precedents, no useful purpose would be served by continuing the proceedings. Consequently, and for the reasons stated above, read with the compromise dated 14.01.2023 (Annexure P-4), this Courts finds it appropriate to invoke the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. and quash the criminal proceedings in the aforesaid case.

As a sequel thereto, the petition is allowed and the complaint No. 54/2016 dated 02.06.2016 under Sections 323,325,341,148,149,504,506,120-B IPC (Annexure P-1), the summoning order dated 18.09.2017 (Annexure P-2) and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom stand quashed on the basis of compromise qua the petitioner only.

Pending application, if any, stand disposed of.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

10.05.2023
seema/sapna

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes /No</i>