

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

296

CRM-M-39923-2022 (O&M)

Date of Decision: 20.11.2023

AMRITPAL SINGH @ GAGGU AND OTHERS

.... Petitioners

VERSUS

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Karanveer Dhaliwal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Harjinder Singh Sidhu, AAG Punjab for respondent No.1.

Mr. Jugraj Singh Waraich, Advocate for respondent No.2.

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.78 dated 17.04.2022 under Sections 354, 354-B, 341 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 18.08.2022 (Annexure P-2).

2. On 09.11.2022 the following order was passed :

“CRM-34606-2022

Application is allowed as prayed for.

*Compromise Deed dated 18.08.2022 is taken on
record as Annexure P-3.*

Main case

Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 seeking quashing of FIR No.78 dated 17.04.2022, registered for offences under Sections 354, 354-B, 341 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short "IPC"), at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, Punjab, Annexure P-1, along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 18.08.2022, arrived at between the parties.

Counsel for the petitioners contends that FIR, Annexure P-1, is a result of a misunderstanding between co-villagers, which has been settled by virtue of compromise, Annexure P-3. Reliance has also been made by the counsel to complainant's affidavit, Annexure P-2, to submit that on the intervention of the respectables of the village, misunderstandings have been removed and the matter has been amicably settled. Still further, it is his contention that as per the allegations levelled in the FIR, complainant's shirt got torn in a scuffle and there was neither any intention to outrage her modesty nor to disrobe her.

Notice of motion.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Jasmanpreet Singh, DAG, Punjab accepts notice of behalf of State-respondent No.1. Upon instructions received from ASI,

Gurmeet Singh, State counsel submits that on conclusion of investigation, challan has been presented under Section 354, 354-B, 323 and 34, IPC, but charge has not been framed.

Mr. Vishal Mittal, Advocate has put in appearance and accepts notice on behalf of complainant-respondent No.2. He has admitted the factum of compromise and supports the prayer made in the petition.

The parties and the Investigating Officer are directed to appear before the Area Magistrate/Trial Court on 30.11.2022 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 the Area Magistrate/Trial Court be awaited for 29.03.2023.”

3. Pursuant to the order dated 09.11.2022, a report dated 02.12.2022 of the learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Malout 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 has no objection to the quashing of the present FIR. Statements of the parties have also been appended with the report.

4. 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.”

5. 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.

6. 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.

7. Resultantly, FIR No.78 dated 17.04.2022 under Sections 354, 354-B, 341 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed on the basis of compromise dated 18.08.2022 (Annexure P-2).

8. The petition is accordingly allowed. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

20.11.2023
Aman Jain

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

NOTE: Whether speaking/non-speaking: Speaking
Whether reportable: Yes/No