

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

279

**CRM-M-23668-2023
Date of decision : 02.08.2023**

Sudhir Rao @ Sudhir Kumar

..... Petitioner

versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Rahul Makkar, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.0371 dated 16.09.2019, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 406 and 420 of IPC and Section 3 of the Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013 (Haryana Act No.32 of 2014), at Police Station Urban Estate, Rohtak, on the basis of compromise deed (Annexure P-2)

2. On 10.05.2023, the following order was passed:-

“The petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No.0371 dated 16.09.2019, registered at Police Station Urban Estate Rohtak, under Sections 406 & 420 IPC and Section 3 of the Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013 (Haryana Act No.32 of 2014) on the basis of compromise.

Notice of motion.

Mr. Himmat Singh, Addl. AG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and waives service.

Mr. Rahul Makkar, Advocate, puts in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and waives service.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 admits the factum of compromise.

The parties are directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate on 05.07.2023 for getting their statements recorded. After recording the statements of the parties, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall send a report to this Court regarding genuineness of compromise between them well before the next date of hearing.

Adjourned to 02.08.2023.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 21.07.2023 from Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak as been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“xx xx xx

(i) *Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without coercion or undue influence?*

Yes, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine, voluntary, without any coercion or undue influence.”

4. Mr. Rahul Makkar, 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 petitioner 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. 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.0371 dated 16.09.2019, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 406 and

420 of IPC and Section 3 of the Haryana Protection of Interest of Depositors in Financial Establishment Act, 2013 (Haryana Act No.32 of 2014), at Police Station Urban Estate, Rohtak and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

02.08.2023
Dinesh

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No