

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-38679-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision : 06.07.2023

Vijay Verma & Anr. ... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of Haryana & Anr. ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Hari Om Verma, Advocate
for the petitioners.
Mr. Vijay Verma-petitioner No.1 in person.

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG Haryana
for respondent No.1.

Mr. P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate with
Ms. Isha Verma-respondent No.2 in person.

ALKA SARIN, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.153 dated 14.09.2019 under Sections 498-A, 406 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC), registered at Police Station Radaur, District Yamunanagar (Annexure P-1) along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 09.05.2022 (Annexure P-2).

2. On 29.08.2022 the following order was passed :

“Prayer in this petition is for quashing of FIR No.153 dated 14.09.2019 under Sections 498-A, 406 and 506 of IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Radaur, District Yamunanagar, Annexure P-1, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of settlement agreement dated 09.05.2022, Annexure P-2, arrived at between the parties.

Counsel for the petitioners submits that FIR is an outcome of a matrimonial dispute between petitioner No.1 and complainant/respondent No.2, which has been settled by settlement agreement, Annexure P-2, arrived at before the Mediation and Conciliation Centre of this Court. Counsel submits that one of the accused namely, Om Parkash Verma, who is the father-in-law of the complainant, has expired. He has referred to Death Certificate, Annexure P-4. Still further, he submits that petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, has been filed for dissolution of marriage and Rs.15 lac out of the agreed permanent alimony of Rs.31 lac has been paid.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. As per instructions received by her from L/ASI Komal, she submits that matter is under investigation and the name of petitioner No.2 has been kept in Column 2.

Mr. G.P.S. Ghuman, Advocate for Mr. P.S. Dhaliwal, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of the

complainant/respondent No.2 and has filed Power of Attorney in Court, which is taken on record. He admits the factum of compromise and does not controvert the statement made by counsel for the petitioners.

The parties and Investigating Officer are directed to appear before the Area Magistrate/Trial Court on 21.11.2022 or on any day thereafter as fixed by the trial court, for getting their statements recorded with regard to the compromise. The Area Magistrate/Trial Court shall submit a report on or before the next date of hearing specifying the following:-

- 1. the number of accused arraigned in the FIR and how many have appeared before it and have made statements and whether any accused is absconding/P.O. in the case;*
- 2. the name of the complainant and injured/aggrieved and whether all of them have appeared and made their statements in support of the compromise;*
- 3. the stage of trial/proceedings;*
- 4. if the compromise is genuine, voluntary and out of free will of the parties.*
- 5. whether any other criminal case is pending against the accused. Report of Area Magistrate/Trial Court be awaited for 21.02.2023.”*

3. Pursuant to the order dated 29.08.2022, report dated 24.11.2022 of the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Jagadhri, has been received by this Court wherein it has been stated that the statements of the parties have been recorded and the parties have stated that they have compromised the matter

voluntarily without any threat, pressure, undue influence or fraud and that the complainant/respondent No.2 has no objection to the quashing of the present FIR. Statements of the parties have also been appended with the report.

4. It has also been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioners that the parties (petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2) have since obtained a mutual consent divorce under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. Respondent No.2-complainant, who is present in Court today, states that she has voluntarily entered into a compromise without any coercion or undue influence and that she would have no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

5. The Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [2012 (10) SCC 303]** 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-dominatingly 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 personal 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.”

6. Learned counsel for the petitioners has also referred to the law laid down by this Court in **Kulwinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052]** wherein it has been held that even in non-compoundable offences, if the parties have entered into a compromise, this Court has wide powers under Section 482 CrPC to quash the proceedings to prevent abuse of law and secure the ends of justice.

7. In view of the above and keeping in view the report by the Trial Court that the parties have genuinely entered into a compromise and all the disputes between the parties have been resolved, it would not be in the interest of justice to continue the criminal proceedings.

8. Resultantly, FIR No.153 dated 14.09.2019 under Sections 498-A, 406 and 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC), registered at Police Station Radaur, District Yamunanagar (Annexure P-1) is quashed, including

CRM-M-38679-2022 (O&M)

-7-

all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 09.05.2022 (Annexure P-2).

9. The petition is accordingly allowed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed off.

06.07.2023
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: YES/NO