

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

267

CRM-M-42549-2022

Date of Decision: 12.01.2023

Anmol Grover

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and Others

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JAGMOHAN BANSAL

Present:- Mr. Yashveer Kharab, Advocate for the petitioner

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG, Haryana

Mr. T.P. Singh, advocate for respondent Nos.2 and 3

JAGMOHAN BANSAL, J. (Oral)

The petitioner through instant petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C, on the basis of Compromise dated 02.09.2022 (Annexure P-2), is seeking quashing of FIR No.746 dated 17.09.2019 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 354 and 354-D of IPC (charges under Section 323 and 452 of IPC also framed), registered at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat, and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom.

In terms of order dated 15.09.2022 of this Court, Chief Judicial Magistrate, Panipat, has submitted his report dated 27.10.2022.

The relevant extracts of the report are as below:-

“ It is humbly submitted that on 12.10.2022, accused Anmol along with complainant namely Manoj Kumar Srivastva and witness/victim Kriti Srivastava appeared before the Court. It is submitted that they have entered into a compromise voluntarily without any external pressure. They were given time to ensure voluntary nature of compromise. In considered view of

undersigned, compromise so effected is for amicable settlement of dispute and was effected without any external pressure, coercion or force and is valid compromise.

It is further submitted that in this case, challan has been filed. Further as per statement of IO dated 17.10.2022, there is only one accused in this case and had never been declared proclaimed person. She further stated that there is one another criminal case in FIR no.1046 dated 12.12.2019 under Section 363, 366A, 376, 216 IPC & 6 POCSO Act is pending against accused Anmol.”

Learned State counsel and learned counsel for private respondents would submit that they have no objection, if the present FIR and subsequent proceedings are quashed.

Relying upon its earlier judgments in '**Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and others, (2012) 10 SCC 303**' and '**The State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (2019) 5 SCC 688**', a two Judge Bench of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in '**Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC online SC 834**' while dealing with power of High Court under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. to quash non-compoundable offences on the basis of compromise between the disputing parties has held:

“11. True it is that offences which are ‘non-compoundable’ cannot be compounded by a criminal court in purported exercise of its powers under Section 320 Cr.P.C. Any such attempt by the court would amount to alteration, addition and modification of Section 320 Cr.P.C, which is the

exclusive domain of Legislature. There is no patent or latent ambiguity in the language of Section 320 Cr.P.C., which may justify its wider interpretation and include such offences in the docket of 'compoundable' offences which have been consciously kept out as non-compoundable. Nevertheless, the limited jurisdiction to compound an offence within the framework of Section 320 Cr.P.C. is not an embargo against invoking inherent powers by the High Court vested in it under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The High Court, keeping in view the peculiar facts and circumstances of a case and for justifiable reasons can press Section 482 Cr.P.C. in aid to prevent abuse of the process of any Court and/or to secure the ends of justice.

12. The High Court, therefore, having regard to the nature of the offence and the fact that parties have amicably settled their dispute and the victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings, can quash such proceedings in exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C., even if the offences are non- compoundable. The High Court can indubitably evaluate the consequential effects of the offence beyond the body of an individual and thereafter adopt a pragmatic approach, to ensure that the felony, even if goes unpunished, does not tinker with or paralyze the very object of the administration of criminal justice system.

13. It appears to us that criminal proceedings involving non-heinous offences or where the offences are pre-dominantly of a private nature, can be annulled irrespective of the fact that trial has already been concluded or appeal stands dismissed against conviction. Handing out punishment is not the sole form of delivering justice.

Societal method of applying laws evenly is always subject to lawful exceptions. It goes without saying, that the cases where compromise is struck post-conviction, the High Court

ought to exercise such discretion with rectitude, keeping in view the circumstances surrounding the incident, the fashion in which the compromise has been arrived at, and with due regard to the nature and seriousness of the offence, besides the conduct of the accused, before and after the incidence. The touchstone for exercising the extra-ordinary power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. would be to secure the ends of justice. There can be no hard and fast line constricting the power of the High Court to do substantial justice. A restrictive construction of inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. may lead to rigid or specious justice, which in the given facts and circumstances of a case, may rather lead to grave injustice.

On the other hand, in cases where heinous offences have been proved against perpetrators, no such benefit ought to be extended, as cautiously observed by this Court in Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Ors.³ and Laxmi Narayan (Supra).

In other words, grave or serious offences or offences which involve moral turpitude or have a harmful effect on the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy, cannot be construed betwixt two individuals or groups only, for such offences have the potential to impact the society at large. Effacing abominable offences through quashing process would not only send a wrong signal to the community but may also accord an undue benefit to unscrupulous habitual or professional offenders, who can secure a 'settlement' through duress, threats, social boycotts, bribes or other dubious means. It is well said that "let no guilty man escape, if it can be avoided."

From the perusal of the enclosed FIR, report of the Trial

contesting parties have amicably resolved their issue, thus, no useful purpose would be served by continuing the proceedings. There appears to be no chance of conviction, thus, continuance of the proceedings would just waste valuable judicial time and it is well-known fact that courts are already over burdened.

In view of above facts and circumstances, the present petition deserves to be allowed and accordingly is allowed. FIR No.746 dated 17.09.2019 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 354 and 354-D of IPC (charges under Section 323 and 452 of IPC also framed), registered at Police Station Panipat City, District Panipat, and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed qua the petitioner.

(JAGMOHAN BANSAL)
JUDGE

12.01.2023
Mohit Kumar

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>