

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

148 CRM-M-30925-2023 (O&M)  
Date of Decision:-21.12.2023

PARAMJIT SINGH ALIAS SUNNY  
... Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER  
... Respondent(s)

-. -

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

-. -

Present:- Mr. Brahminder Singh Toor, Advocate  
for the petitioner.  
  
Mr. Kiran Pal Singh, AAG, Haryana.  
  
Mr. Puneet Sharma, Advocate  
for respondent No.2.

-. -

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU , J.

1. Present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.66 dated 23.03.2023 (P-1), under Sections 406, 420, 506 IPC, registered at Police Station, Panjokhra, District Ambala, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 07.06.2023 (P-2), entered into between the parties i.e. petitioner as well as respondent No.2.

2. Allegations against the petitioner are that he duped the complainant on the pretext of selling a plot.

3. A Co-ordinate Bench, while issuing notice of motion on 15.09.2023, passed the following order:-

*“Reply has been filed by the learned State counsel as well as by respondent No.2 in the Court today and the same are taken on record.*

*In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court for recording their respective statements with regard to compromise/settlement on 26.09.2023.*

*The Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court is directed to submit a report along with copies of statements of the parties on or before the next date of hearing containing the following information as well:-*

*(i) Number of persons arrayed as accused in FIR;*

*(ii) Whether any accused is proclaimed offender?*

*(iii) Status of trial/proceedings.*

*(iv) Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary, and without any coercion or undue influence.*

*List on 07.11.2023, for awaiting the report .”*

4. In terms of aforesaid order, statements of both the parties were recorded and a report dated 27.09.2023 has been submitted in this regard by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ambala. The operative part of the same reads as under:-

*“As such, from statements of the parties, I am of the opinion that the compromise arrived between the complainant and all the aforesaid accused is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion undue influence.*

*Report in the matter alongwith original statements, photostat copies of Aadhar card of the parties and compromise Ex.C1 are ecnlosed herewith for consideration of the Hon'ble High Court, pleas"*

5. A perusal of the aforesaid report clearly reveals that the matter has been compromised by both the parties with their free consent, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. Even before this Court also, there is no objection by either of the parties against the compromise.

6. Learned State Counsel, on instructions from the police officer present in the Court, also submitted that they have no objection in case the aforesaid FIR as well as consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis of the compromise effected between the parties.

7. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303**, has held as under:-

*"61. 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 FIR may be exercised where the offender and the 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 a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under*

*special statutes like the 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 predominatingly civil flavour stand on a 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, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the 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 the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”*

8. In view of above, this Court is fully convinced that the offence is entirely personal in nature and does not involve any public funds. Thus, quashing of the FIR in question along with consequential proceedings, on the basis of compromise would bring peace and harmony to secure the ends of justice.

9. Consequently, present petition is allowed; aforesaid FIR along with all consequential proceedings resulting therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner(s). However, as a deterrence for the future, petitioner(s) shall bear costs of ₹1,00,000/-. Costs be deposited with Punjab and Haryana High

Court Bar Association, Chandigarh Lawyers Family Welfare Fund. It is made clear that in case of failure, same would be recovered as arrears of land revenue. Needless to add, the costs imposed today shall not be treated as penalty and is for welfare of the society.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

21.12.2023  
Gaurav Sorot

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)  
JUDGE

|                              |          |
|------------------------------|----------|
| Whether reasoned / speaking? | Yes / No |
| Whether reportable?          | Yes / No |