

279

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

CRM-M-29294-2023
Date of decision : 09.10.2023

SANDEEP SINGH AND ANOTHERPetitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

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

Mr. Kunal Vinayak, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Sandeep Bokolia, Advocate for
Mr. J.S. Lalli, Advocate for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.155 dated 29.09.2022, registered for offences punishable under Section 379-B of IPC (Section 411 of IPC added later on), at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda (Annexure P-1) on the basis of compromise.

2. On 04.08.2023, the following order was passed :-

“The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.155 dated 29.09.2022, registered for offences punishable under Section 379-B of IPC (Section 411 of IPC added later on), at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda and all subsequent proceedings arising thereto on the basis of compromise.

Reply dated 31.07.2023 by way of affidavit of Amarjit Singh, PPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, (PBI, Homocide and Forensic) Bathinda officiating as Deputy Superintendent of Police, (Rural), Bathinda, District Bathinda has been filed on behalf of the respondent No.1-State of Punjab in the Court today, the same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to the counsel opposite.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the matter already stands compromised vide compromise deed dated 26.05.2023 (Annexure P-2).

The parties are directed to appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 19.08.2023 with respect to the compromise and on their doing so, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court/Duty Magistrate shall record their statements and furnish its report to this Court by the next date of hearing on the following aspects:-

1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the 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 case 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.

A copy of the report be also sent to the Registrar Judicial of this Court.

Needless to say that in case for any reason the statements are not recorded on the aforesaid date, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter.

To come up on 09.10.2023. ”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from JMIC, Bathinda dated 04.10.2023 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the

report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

- “1) Total two persons are arrayed as accused in this FIR i.e. Sandeep Singh and Amrinderpal Singh
- 2) No accused is proclaimed offender;
- 3) Compromise between the parties is genuine and it is voluntarily effected between the parties with their free will and without any pressure, threat, coercion or undue influence from any quarter;
- 4) Accused Sandeep Singh is not involved in any other case FIR, but accused Amrinderpal Singh @ Bablu son of Baldev Singh is involved in three other cases i.e. FIR No. 2 dated 14.03.2023 under section 03 R.P. (U.P) Act and sections 153 and 147 of Railway Act, Police Station RPF Mansa, FIR No. 3 dated 15.03.2023 under section 03 R.P. (U.P) Act and section 147 of Railway Act, Police Station RPF Mansa and FIR No. 8 dated 24.12.2022 under section 03 R.P. (U.P) Act and section 147 of Railway Act, Police Station RPF Mansa and the said cases are pending;
- 5) There is only one victim/complainant in this FIR namely complainant/victim Shob Dass son of Saheb Din, resident of ward No. 41, street no. 33/2, house no. 33064, Paras Ram Nagar, Bathinda and except him there is no other complainant/victim in this FIR.”

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.155 dated

29.09.2022, registered for offences punishable under Section 379-B of IPC (Section 411 of IPC added later on), at Police Station Sadar Bathinda, District Bathinda (Annexure P-1) and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

October 09, 2023	(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr	Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned	: Yes/No
Whether reportable	: Yes/No