

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

132

CRM-M-28983-2023

Date of Decision : 02.06.2023

Gagan Kumar and another

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present : Mr.Vinod Pundir, Advocate for
Mr.V.S.Mand, Advocate
for the petitioners.

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

1. The petitioners through instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C., on the basis of compromise, are seeking quashing of FIR No.232 dated 13.09.2019 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 323/341/506/34 of IPC (Section 354 of IPC added later on), registered at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Ludhiana, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* contends that marriage of petitioner No.1 was solemnised with respondent No.2 on 01.06.2015 according to Sikh rites and ceremonies. Unfortunately, couple could not pull on the nuptial tie and marriage miserably failed. Both the parties entered into compromise and it was decided to part their ways by mutual consent. Both the parties filed a petition under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 seeking dissolution of marriage by mutual consent before the Family Court at Ludhiana. The 1st motion

statement has already been recorded and 2nd motion statement is going to be recorded on 11.07.2023. The parties have decided to withdraw all civil and criminal cases pending against each other. The complainant had lodged two FIRs against the petitioners. FIR No.7 dated 16.01.2018 under Sections 406, 498A IPC stands quashed by this Court vide order dated 04.05.2023 passed in CRM-M-17377-2023 on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties. Before passing order dated 04.05.2023, this Court directed the parties to appear before trial Court to tender their statements in support of compromise. This Court has passed order dated 04.05.2023 after considering compromise arrived at between the parties as well as report of Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, confirming voluntarily nature of compromise.

3. Notice of motion.

4. Ms.Guramrit Kaur, DAG, Punjab, who on advance notice is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 1-State.

5. Mr.Bhupinder Singh, Advocate has filed his power of attorney on behalf of the respondent No.2, which is taken on record.

6. With the consent of the parties, the matter is taken up for final disposal because there seems no reason to keep the matter pending.

7. Learned State counsel on instruction from ASI Surinderpal Singh and learned counsel for respondent No.2 submitted that they have no objection if FIR and consequent proceedings, in view of compromise, are quashed.

8. Relying upon its earlier judgments in 'Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others, (2012) 10 SCC 303' and 'The State of Madhya

Pradesh Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (2019) 5 SCC 688', a two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '*Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC online SC 834'* while dealing with power of High Court under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. to quash non-compoundable offences on the basis of compromise between the disputing parties has held:

“11. True it is that offences which are ‘non-compoundable’ cannot be compounded by a criminal court in purported exercise of its powers under [Section 320](#) Cr.P.C. Any such attempt by the court would amount to alteration, addition and modification of [Section 320](#) Cr.P.C, which is the exclusive domain of Legislature. There is no patent or latent ambiguity in the language of [Section 320](#) Cr.P.C., which may justify its wider interpretation and include such offences in the docket of ‘compoundable’ offences which have been consciously kept out as non-compoundable. Nevertheless, the limited jurisdiction to compound an offence within the framework of [Section 320](#) Cr.P.C. is not an embargo against invoking inherent powers by the High Court vested in it under [Section 482](#) Cr.P.C. The High Court, keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of a case and for justifiable reasons can press [Section 482](#) Cr.P.C. in aid to prevent abuse of the process of any Court and/or to secure the ends of justice.

12. The High Court, therefore, having regard to the nature of the offence and the fact that parties have amicably settled their dispute and the victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings, can quash such proceedings in exercise of its inherent powers under [Section 482](#) Cr.P.C., even

if the offences are non- compoundable. The High Court can indubitably evaluate the consequential effects of the offence beyond the body of an individual and thereafter adopt a pragmatic approach, to ensure that the felony, even if goes unpunished, does not tinker with or paralyze the very object of the administration of criminal justice system.

13. It appears to us that criminal proceedings involving non-heinous offences or where the offences are pre-dominantly of a private nature, can be annulled irrespective of the fact that trial has already been concluded or appeal stands dismissed against conviction. Handing out punishment is not the sole form of delivering justice. Societal method of applying laws evenly is always subject to lawful exceptions. It goes without saying, that the cases where compromise is struck post-conviction, the High Court ought to exercise such discretion with rectitude, keeping in view the circumstances surrounding the incident, the fashion in which the compromise has been arrived at, and with due regard to the nature and seriousness of the offence, besides the conduct of the accused, before and after the incidence. The touchstone for exercising the extra-ordinary power under [Section 482 Cr.P.C.](#) would be to secure the ends of justice. There can be no hard and fast line constricting the power of the High Court to do substantial justice. A restrictive construction of inherent powers under [Section 482 Cr.P.C.](#) may lead to rigid or specious justice, which in the given facts and circumstances of a case, may rather lead to grave injustice. On the other hand, in cases where heinous offences have been proved against perpetrators, no such benefit ought to be extended, as cautiously observed by this Court in

Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Ors. and Laxmi Narayan (Supra).

14. In other words, grave or serious offences or offences which involve moral turpitude or have a harmful effect on the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy, cannot be construed between two individuals or groups only, for such offences have the potential to impact the society at large. Effacing abominable offences through quashing process would not only send a wrong signal to the community but may also accord an undue benefit to unscrupulous habitual or professional offenders, who can secure a 'settlement' through duress, threats, social boycotts, bribes or other dubious means. It is well said that "let no guilty man escape, if it can be avoided."

9. From the perusal of the enclosed FIR, statement of learned counsels for the parties and compromise arrived at between the parties, it transpires that contesting parties have amicably resolved their issue, thus, no useful purpose would be served by continuing the proceedings. The alleged offences are of pre-dominantly private in nature and no moral turpitude or interest of public at large is involved. There appears to be no chance of conviction, the continuance of the proceedings would just waste valuable judicial time and it is well-known fact that courts are already over burdened.

10. In view of above facts and circumstances, the present petition deserves to be allowed and accordingly allowed.

11. FIR No.232 dated 13.09.2019 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 323/341/506/34 of IPC (Section 354 of IPC added later on),

registered at Police Station Salem Tabri, District Ludhiana and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner(s).

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

02.06.2023
anju

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>