

2023:PHHC:166184

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

282

CRM-M-8824-2023

Date of decision : 18.12.2023

Sajan Kumar @ Sajjan**..... Petitioners****versus****State of Punjab and another****..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. P.S. Bhandari, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Kunal Vinayak, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. H.P.S. Sandhu, Advocate
for respondent No.2

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.12 dated 03.02.2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 453, 380 of IPC, 1860 (Section 411 of IPC, 1860 added later on) at Police Station Dera Baba Nanak, Batala, District Batala on the basis of compromise deed dated 03.02.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. On 09.10.2023, the following order was passed:-

“CRM-40932-2023

This is an application for amendment in the headnote as well as in the prayer clause of the main petition on the ground that offence punishable under Section 411 IPC has been added later on.

For the reasons recorded in the application, the same is allowed. The amendment as sought for, is allowed.

2023:PHHC:166184

Registry is directed to carry out necessary correction in the headnote and prayer clause of the main petition.

CRM-M-8824-2023 (O&M)

The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No.12 dated 03.02.2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 453, 380 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 411 IPC added later on) at Police Station Dera Baba Nanak, Batala, District Batala and all subsequent proceedings arising thereto on the basis of compromise.

Short reply by way of an affidavit of Maninder Pal Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sub Division Dera Baba Nanak, Police District Batala has been filed on behalf of respondent No.1-State today in Court. The same is taken on record.

Counsels for the parties are ad idem that the matter already stands compromised vide Annexure P-2.

In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate on 30.10.2023. On their doing so, the learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate 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?

2023:PHHC:166184

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 Trial Court/Duty Magistrate shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter.

For awaiting report, list on 18.12.2023.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 06.11.2023 from JMIC, Batala has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“XX XX XX

1. It is submitted that as per statement of investigating officer the present FIR has been registered against one person namely Sajjan Kumar @Sajjan i.e. petitioner.
2. None of the accused has been declared as proclaimed person/offender in the present case.
3. In view of the statements got recorded by both the parties, this court is satisfied that the compromise effected between them is genuine, which is not the result of any pressure or coercion.
4. It is submitted that as per statement of investigating officer, no other FIR/complaint is pending against accused person at P.S. Dera Baba Nanak.

2023:PHHC:166184

5. It is submitted that as per statement of investigating officer, in the present FIR, there are only one victim/complainant and the present FIR has been registered against one person namely Sajjan Kumar @ Sajjan i.e. petitioner.”

4. Mr. H.P.S. Sandhu, 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 petitioners are quashed.

5. Learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.

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

7. This Court and Apex Court has repeatedly dealt with the issue of exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash proceedings in non-compoundable offences in the cases of ***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 much wider and is unaffected 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*

2023:PHHC:166184

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 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.

8. 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) i.e. heinous offence.*
- (ii) The offences alleged are of private nature.*
- (iii) The parties have compromised.*
- (iv) As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.*
- (v) Complainant/victim is reported to have entered into compromise on his own volition.*

9. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.12 dated 03.02.2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 453, 380 of IPC, 1860 (Section 411 of IPC, 1860 added later on) at Police Station Dera Baba Nanak, Batala, District Batala and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

18.12.2023
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No