

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

**CRM-M No. 32511 of 2022
Date of Decision: 31.01.2023**

Manoj Kumar Singla and another.

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another.

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Devansh Khanna, Advocate and
Ms. Sapna Khurana, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Harjinder Singh Sidhu, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. Sumanpreet Aulakh, Advocate for
Mr. Vaibhav Narang, Advocate
for the complainant-respondent no.2.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

This petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.77 dated 14.09.2021 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City-2 Abohar, District Fazilka and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 11.10.2021 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Vide order dated 07.12.2022 of this Court, the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Abohar

has submitted a consolidated report, vide letter dated 17.01.2023, which

“ xxx xxx xxx

i. *There are only two accused in the present FIR.*

ii. *The case is at the stage of investigation.*

iii. *No accused in the present case has been declared as proclaimed offender.*

iv. *The accused are not involved in any other case.*

v. *Yes, all the concerned have signed the compromise deed.*

vi. *The compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence.*

vii. *As per the statement of investigating officer, there is only one complainant/victim namely Surinder Singla son of Thandi Ram in the present case .*

xxx xxx xxx ”

Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 has again reiterated that the matter has been settled and the said compromise is in the interest of all the persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the parties.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper book.

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of “**Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another**”, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543 has held as under:-

“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 exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences 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 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 personnel 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.”

In “***Shakuntala Sawhney Vs. Kaushalya Sawhney***”, 1979 (3)

SCR 639, at P 642, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the finest hour of Justice arises propitiously when parties, who fell apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.

Considering the entire facts, compromise arrived at between the parties, statements of the parties recorded before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial

Magistrate Ist Class, Abohar, since the parties have arrived at a compromise by amicably settling their disputes and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose will be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Further, in the light of the above-mentioned judicial precedents, when the parties have entered into a compromise then continuation of the proceedings would be mere an abuse of process of the Court.

In order to prevent unnecessary continuation of criminal proceedings on the ground that there are bleak chances of conviction in the case, I am of the considered view that it would be in fitness of things to quash the proceedings on the basis of compromise and by quashing the FIR while accepting the prayer of the petitioners, would be securing the ends of justice.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.77 dated 14.09.2021 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, registered at Police Station City-2 Abohar, District Fazilka and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed *qua* the petitioners herein only.

Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements made in the Court below.

All pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

31.01.2023
mkkoundal

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : ***Yes/No***

Whether reportable : ***Yes/No***