

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

CRM-M-20295 of 2023

Date of decision : 22.08.2023

Rishab Nayyar @ Rishav Nayyar and others

....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Liaqat Ali, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Kunal Vinayak, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Vikrant Kaundal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.76 dated 09.08.2016, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323/451/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Division No.1, District Ludhiana (Annexure P-1) on the basis of compromise.

2. On 25.04.2023, the following order was passed :-

“Prayer in this petition is for quashing of the FIR No.76 dated 09.08.2016, registered under Section 323/451/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Division No.1, District Ludhiana (Annexure P-1), on the basis of the compromise dated 03.03.2023 (Annexure P-2) entered into between the parties.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. M.S. Nagra, A.A.G., Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Mr. Vikrant Kaundal, Advocate, has put in appearance on

behalf of respondent No.2 and filed his Power of Attorney, which is taken on record. He also admits the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties.

List on 22.08.2023.

Meanwhile, the parties are directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Area Magistrate on 02.06.2023 or any other convenient date to the Court and to get their statements recorded regarding the compromise.

The trial Court/Area Magistrate is directed to submit a report on or before the next date of hearing containing the following information:

1. *Number of persons arrayed as accused in FIR,*
2. *Whether any accused is proclaimed offender,*
3. *Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence,*
4. *Whether the accused persons are involved in any other FIR 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.”*

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from JMIC, Ludhiana dated 10.07.2023 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“i) The FIR was lodged against accused persons namely Rishab Nayyar @ Raju S/o Dev Raj, Rana Nayyar S/o Raj Dev, Dhimyant @ Dhanu S/o Rana Nayyar and Prince.

Subsequently challan was presented against Rishab Nayyar, Dhimyant @ Dhanu and Jyoti. Accused Rana Nayyar and Paras @ Prince have been kept in column No. 2 of the challan.

ii) As per the statement of Investigating Officer, no accused has been declared proclaimed offender, and no any such proceedings have been initiated or pending against any person in the present FIR;

iii) As per the statements of the parties, compromise appears to

be genuine one and also appears to be entered into voluntarily with free will of the parties without any coercion or undue influence or pressure of any kind;

iv) As per the statement of Investigating officer, there is no involvement of the accused/petitioners in any other FIR at P.S. Division No. 1, Ludhiana;

(v) On dated 07.07.2023, the statement of Investigating Officer SI Jaswinder Singh No. 2164/Batala has been recorded and as per his statement, in the present FIR only one complainant/victim namely Jagdish Kumar S/o Ram Parkash.”

4. Ld. Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 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. Similarly Ld. State Counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.

6. I have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

7. After considering judgment rendered by the Apex Court in **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 not affected 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 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).
- (ii) The offences 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 has entered into compromise on his own volition.

9. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.76 dated 09.08.2016, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 323/451/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Division No.1, District Ludhiana (Annexure P-1) and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

August 22, 2023
Dpr

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No