

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**267****CRM-M No.10581 of 2022****Date of Decision : 09.08.2023**

Saurav Gangwani and Others

....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Haryana and Another

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate for
Mr. Arpan Sabharwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG Haryana for respondent No.1.

Mr. Rahul Noorie, Advocate for
Mr. Abhimanyu Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

ALKA SARIN, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.517 dated 28.10.2018 registered under Sections 323, 34, 376, 377, 406, 498-A and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Rai, District Sonapat and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of a compromise (Annexure P-2).

2. Learned State counsel on instructions from ASI Suman at the outset states that the offences under Sections 376 and 377 IPC stood deleted vide order dated 06.12.2018.

3. On 30.01.2023 the parties were directed to get their statements recorded. Pursuant to order dated 30.01.2023, statements of the parties have been recorded. As per statements of the parties, they have compromised the matter voluntarily and out of their free will and the complainant/respondent

No.2 has stated that she would have no objection if the present FIR is quashed. Statements of the parties have also been appended with the report.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 states that the compromise has been entered into by respondent No.2 willingly and without any coercion or pressure and that he would have no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

5. The Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [2012 (10) SCC 303]** 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-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.”

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners has also referred to the law laid down by this Court in **Kulwinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052]** wherein it has been held that even in non-compoundable offences, if the parties have entered into a compromise, this Court has wide powers under Section 482 CrPC to quash the proceedings to prevent abuse of law and secure the ends of justice.

7. In view of the above and keeping in view the report by the Trial Court that the parties have genuinely entered into a compromise and all the disputes between the parties have been resolved, it would not be in the interest of justice to continue the criminal proceedings.

8. Resultantly, FIR No.517 dated 28.10.2018 registered under Sections 323, 34, 376, 377, 406, 498-A and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Sections 376 and 377 IPC stood deleted) at Police Station Rai, District

Sonepat is quashed, including all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

9. The petition is accordingly allowed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

09.08.2023

jk

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO