

CRM-M-56677-2022 (O&M)

1

261

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-56677-2022 (O&M)
Date of decision : 19.09.2023

Pardeep & Ors. ... Petitioner(s)

Versus

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

CORAM : HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE ALKA SARIN

Present : Mr. Vivek Khatri, Advocate for the petitioners.

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

Mr. Naveen Kumar, 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.63 dated 16.02.2020 registered under Sections 323, 354-A, 377, 498-A, 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Gohana Sadar, District Sonipat (Annexure P-1), and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise as is apparent from the affidavit dated 27.09.2022 (Annexure P-3).
2. On 05.12.2022 the following order was passed :

“Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C, seeking quashing of FIR No.63 dated 16.02.2020 registered under Sections 323, 354-A, 377, 498-A, 506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Gohana Sadar, District Sonipat (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise as is apparent from the affidavit dated 27.09.2022 (Annexure P-3) executed by the complainant-respondent No.2.

Counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1 is the husband of the complainant-respondent No.2 and petitioners No.2 to 4 are the relatives of petitioner No.1. He submits that FIR (Annexure P-1), which is an outcome of a matrimonial dispute, has been settled by compromise (Annexure P-3). He submits that marriage has been dissolved by mutual consent on 29.09.2022 and all the expenses etc., have 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 her instructions received from L/ASI Reena, she submits that charge has been framed against the accused petitioners and prosecution evidence is underway. She has specific instructions to state that the complainant has been examined and she has turned hostile.

Mr.Naveen Kumar, Advocate, appears on behalf of the complainant-respondent No.2 and has filed his 'Vakalatnama', which is taken on record. He has admitted the factum of compromise and does not dispute the statement made by counsel for the petitioners.

Parties and Investigating Officer are directed to appear before the Trial Court/Area Magistrate on 11.01.2023 or on any day thereafter, as ordered by the Magistrate for getting their statements recorded with regard to the compromise. The Trial Court/Area Magistrate shall submit a report 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 Trial Court/Area Magistrate be awaited for 12.07.2023.

Judgment and decree of divorce be placed on record before the next date. ”

3. Pursuant to the order dated 05.12.2022 a report dated 20.01.2023 of the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Gohana (Sonipat) 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. 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-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 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.63 dated 16.02.2020 registered under Sections 323, 354-A, 377, 498-A, 506 of IPC at Police Station Gohana Sadar, District Sonipat (Annexure P-1) is quashed, including all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise as is apparent from the affidavit dated 27.09.2022 (Annexure P-3).

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

19.09.2023

Yogesh Sharma

(ALKA SARIN)

JUDGE

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