

CRM-M-44036-2022 (O&M)

1

276

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-44036-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision : 22.08.2023

Pardeep Kumar & Ors. ... Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and Another ... Respondent(s)

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Johan Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Priyanka Sadar, AAG Haryana, for respondent No.1.

Mr. Akshit Mehta, 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.860 dated 26.11.2015 under Sections 498-A, 406, 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Ballabgarh City, District Faridabad and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of a compromise (Annexure P-2).
2. On 16.11.2022 the following order was passed :

*“Petitioners are seeking to quash the FIR No.860
dated 26.11.2015 under Sections 498-A/406/506 IPC,*

registered at Police Station Ballabgarh, District Faridabad on the basis of compromise having been effected between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that the complaint was submitted against the petitioners and 02 other relatives but during the course of investigation, the other relatives were found innocent and the challan has been presented only against the petitioners. The marriage of petitioner No.1 was solemnized with respondent No.2 on 22.02.2011 and a child was born from the wedlock but unfortunately, he has died. The parties are living separate from each other since 15.04.2015. The matrimonial dispute has been amicably settled between them. The marriage of petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 has been dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consent under Section 13-B of Hindu Marriage Act in terms of judgment and decree dated 23.09.2022 by the learned Family Court, Faridbad. A sum of Rs.5,00,000/- has been paid on account of permanent alimony to respondent No.2. No other case is pending between the parties.

Mr. Zorawar Singh Chauhan, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Mr. Akshit Mehta, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and filed power of attorney. He has acknowledged the fact of compromise.

The parties are directed to appear before the learned Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court for recording their statements with regard to compromise/settlement on 16.12.2022. It is made clear that if for any reason, the statements are not recorded on that date, the same may

be recorded on any date convenient to the Court concerned.

The learned Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court is directed to submit a report on or before the next date of hearing containing the following information:

- 1. Number of persons arraigned as accused in FIR;*
- 2. Whether any accused is proclaimed offender;*
- 3. Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence;*
- 4. Whether the accused persons are involved in any other case or not;*
- 5. The trial Court is also directed to record the statement of the Investigating Officer as to how many victims/complainants are there in the FIR.*

To await the report, list again on 16.02.2023.”

3. Pursuant to the order dated 16.11.2022 a report dated 20.12.2022 of the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Faridabad 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. Learned counsel for the petitioner has also pointed out that in a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, second motion statements have also been recorded.

5. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has reiterated that the parties have since compromised the matter and that he has no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

6. 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.”

7. Learned counsel for the petitioner 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.

8. 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.

9. Resultantly, FIR No.860 dated 26.11.2015 under Sections 498-A, 406, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station Ballabgarh City, District Faridabad is quashed, including all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of a compromise (Annexure P-2).

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

22.08.2023
Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)
JUDGE

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