

256(2) IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-23948-2022

Date of Decision: 24.05.2023

Prem Lal and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DEEPAK MANCHANDA

Present: Mr. Lupil Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Digvijay Nagpal, AAG, Punjab
for respondent No.1/State.

Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Arun Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for the respondents No. 2 to 5.

DEEPAK MANCHANDA J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for the quashing of FIR No.29 dated 15.04.2021 under Sections 452, 323, 34, 325 of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Mamdot, District Ferozepur, Annexure P-1 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-2).

Mr. Mandeep Singh, Advocate for Mr. Arun Kumar Gupta, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2/complainant and respondents No.3 to 5 and admitted the factum of compromise. This Court on 31.05.2022 after issuing notice of motion had directed the private parties to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate within 30 days 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.

Brief facts of the case are that on 10.04.2021 the petitioners at around 8.30 PM were sitting outside their Haveli situated next to the complainant's house and the complainant's son asked them to either go inside their Haveli or to their house thereupon, which the petitioners raised a lalkara and stated giving beatings to the complainant's son with bricks and gravel, dang and bat and also gave beatings to the complainant and his sister in law and brother in law.

In pursuance of the said order, the report of Judicial Magistrate First Class, Ferozepur forwarded vide letter no. 516 dated 16.07.2022 has been submitted, which is already on record. The relevant part of the report is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“ In view of the statements suffered by both the parties following information is hereby sent to your goodself:-

i) As per statement of I.O, there are five accused arrayed in the FIR namely Prem Lal, Tarsem Pal, Sunil, Nitin (mentioned in FIR but original name is Narinder Pal) and Rohan.

ii)As per statement of I.O, none of the above named accused is proclaimed offender.

iii) Compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

iv)As per statement of I.O none of the accused has been involved in any other FIR.

v) There is one complainant namely Santosh Rani and three injured/victims namely Baldev Raj, Sanjeev Kumar and Seema Rani.”

Though no reply has been filed by the State, however, learned State counsel does not dispute if the FIR in question is quashed on the basis of compromise effected between the private parties.

A perusal of the report received from Judicial Magistrate First Class, Ferozepur 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 and respondents No. 3 to 5 have 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.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that no other FIR is registered against the petitioners and they have not been declared as proclaimed offenders and learned State counsel has not disputed this fact.

Having heard the 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, where the case is at the stage of investigation 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 inherent power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. to quash an F.I.R. 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-Debita 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-dominantly 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.”

Hon’ble Apex Court further observed in ***State of Madhya Pradesh v/s Lakshmi Narayan (2019)5 SCC 688*** and the relevant portion of the same is reproduced hereinbelow:-

“xxx...xxx

29.xx xx

29.7. 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. It is because of the reason that at this stage the investigation is still on and even the charge-sheet has not been filed.

xxx....xxx”

The view taken by this Court also finds support from the recent judgment of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in ***Ram Gopal & Anr. Vs. 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 Judicial Magistrate First Class, Ferozepur the compromise (Annexure P-2) and the principles laid down in conspectus of aforesaid judicial precedents, no useful purpose would be served by continuing the proceedings. Therefore, this petition is allowed and FIR No.29 dated 15.04.2021 under Sections 452, 323, 34, 325 of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Mamdot, District Ferozepur, Annexure P-1 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise ***are hereby quashed***, qua the petitioners.

(DEEPAK MANCHANDA)
JUDGE

24.05.2023
sapna

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No