

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

289

CRM-M No.10761 of 2023

Date of Decision : 17.07.2023

Ajay Verma

....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and Another

....Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Tejinder Pal Singh, Advocate for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Prabhdeep Singh Toor, 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.742 dated 22.10.2021 registered under Section 294 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (later on Section 294 IPC was deleted and charges were framed under Section 354-D IPC) at Police Station Old Industrial Panipat, District Panipat and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 08.02.2023 (Annexure P-4).

2. On 01.03.2023 the following order was passed :

“This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.742 dated 22.10.2021, registered under Section 294 IPC (Section 294 IPC has been deleted later on and charge was framed under Section 354-D of IPC) at Police Station Old Industrial Panipat, District Panipat (Annexure P-1) and

all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise said to have been entered into between the parties dated 08.02.2023 (Annexure P-4).

Notice of motion.

Ms. Mahima Yashpal, Deputy Advocate General, Haryana, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Mr. Prabhdeep Singh Toor, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2, by filing vakalatnama and the same is taken on record.

Let the parties appear before the trial Court/Duty Magistrate on 17.04.2023 or any other date convenient to the Court, for recording their statements with regard to compromise. The trial Court/Duty Magistrate is directed to submit a report on or before the next date of hearing as regards authenticity and genuineness of compromise after recording statements of all the parties: The trial Court/Duty Magistrate shall also furnish the following information:

- 1. Whether there is any other accused, apart from the petitioners arrayed in this petition.*
- 2. Whether there is any other complainant or affected/aggrieved party, apart from the respondents arrayed in the petition.*
- 3. Whether the parties are involved in any other criminal case.*

4. *Whether any of the parties has been declared a proclaimed offender.*

The trial Court/Duty Magistrate shall send his/her report through the Sessions Judge concerned on or before the date fixed, i.e., 17.07.2023.”

3. Pursuant to order dated 01.03.2023, report dated 27.04.2023 of the Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Panipat has been received by this Court wherein it has been stated that the statements of the parties have been recorded and the parties have stated that they have compromised the matter voluntarily with their free will, without any coercion or undue influence and that the complainant/respondent No.2 has no objection to the quashing of the present FIR. Statements of the parties have also been appended with the report.

4. 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.”

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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.

6. 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.

7. Resultantly, FIR No.742 dated 22.10.2021 registered under Section 294 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (later on Section 294 IPC was deleted and charges were framed under Section 354-D IPC) at Police Station Old Industrial Panipat, District Panipat is quashed, including all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 08.02.2023 (Annexure P-4).

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

17.07.2023
jk

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

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