

251

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

**CRM-M-37975-2020
Date of Decision: 19.01.2023**

Sahil Narang

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Ms. Gauri, Advocate for
Mr. Aman Pal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ram K.Singla, DAG, Haryana
for respondent No.1/State.

Mr. Sandeep Kumar Bansal, Advocate
for respondent No.2/complainant.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

This petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed for quashing of FIR No.613 dated 27.07.2018 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 323 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Sonipat City, District Sonipat, Haryana, and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 23.07.2021 (Annexure P-5) arrived at between the parties.

Vide order dated 18.11.2020, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the

compromise.

In compliance thereof, the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat, has submitted a consolidated report, vide letter dated 16.01.2023, which indicates that the parties appeared before the Magistrate and got recorded their respective statements with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the report, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and with free will and consent. Relevant extract of the said report is reproduced as under:

*“i) In the present case, an application for recording the statement as per the order dated 20.12.2022 was moved by the accused Sahil. Keeping in view the observation of the Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, Chandigarh in order dated 20.12.2022, complainant appeared through **what's app call** in which she has stated that she has compromised the matter with the accused namely Sahil Narang without any pressure from any quarter and has no objection if the FIR No.613 dated 27.07.2018 under Sections 323, 506 of IPC, PS City, Sonapat, is quashed against the accused. Statement of complainant is **Annexure-I**, (Annexed herewith in original).*

*Statement of HC Rajesh who has identified the complainant was also recorded in which he has stated that complainant has compromised the matter with the accused namely Sahil Narang without any pressure from any quarter. The complainant has no objection if the FIR No.613 dated 27.07.2018 under Sections 323, 506 of IPC, PS City, Sonapat, is quashed against the accused. Statement of complainant is **Annexure-I**, (Annexed herewith in original) and statement of IO in this regard is **Annexure-IV**, (Annexed herewith in original).*

*In the similar manner, the accused Sahil Narang, identified by his counsel Sh. Monarch, suffered a statement respectively, that he has compromised the matter with the complainant Anchal without any pressure from any quarter and FRI No.613 dated 27.07.2018 under Sections 323, 506 of IPC, PS City, Sonapat, may be quashed. The statement of accused Sahil is **Annexure-II** and is attached herewith in original.*

It is to be noted had there been any pressure of any kind on any of the persons, who had given statements before this court, then they could bring to notice of this court about that fact, but none of the persons, who had given statements, had stated that they are under pressure of any kind. Had the complainant or accused been under any pressure and had they been hesitant to bring to the notice about this fact to this court, they could at least bring to the notice (about the pressure) to the ld. counsel, but even the ld. Counsel has not stated before this court that any of the person/party is under pressure of any kind.

*In these circumstances, **it is concluded that the statements of the parties are bona fide and are not result of any threat, duress or coercion in any manner and hence compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence and is valid one.***

*ii) In the abovesaid FRI No.613 dated 27.07.2018 under Sections 323, 506 of IPC, PS City, Sonapat, IO of the present case appeared and suffered a statement, which is **Annexure-III** (Annexed herewith in original). As per statement of I.O./HC Rajesh No.2003/SPT, PS City Sonapat, in the present case bearing FIR No.613 dated 27.07.2018 under Sections 323, 506 of IPC, PS City, Sonapat, accused Sahil Narang is the only*

accused arrayed in the present FIR. There is no other case registered against him in his knowledge and Aanchal w/o Pardeep is the only victim/complainant in the present FIR.

- x - x - x - ”

A perusal of the said report would show that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the case, who have stated that the matter has been compromised and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. They have further stated that the said compromise arrived at between them is genuine, voluntary and without any pressure.

Learned State counsel does not raise any serious dispute regarding quashing of the FIR in question.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant 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 file.

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 Court and also report dated 16.01.2023, submitted by the Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sonapat, 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 abovementioned 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 petitioner, would be securing the ends of

justice.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.613 dated 27.07.2018 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 323 and 506 IPC, registered at Police Station Sonipat City, District Sonipat, Haryana and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioner. However, the same would be subject to payment of costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with the **“Poor Patients' Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh”** and the said amount would be spent for the treatment of poor patients within the knowledge of its Medical Superintendent.

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.

19.01.2023

Apurva

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No