

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

Date of decision : 18.12.2023

1. CRM-M-45320-2023

Tarsem Lal and others Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and another Respondents

2. CRM-M-45486-2023

Gurmukh Singh and another Petitioners

versus

State of Punjab and another Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present: Mr. Jagjit Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M-45320-2023 and
for respondent No.2 in CRM-M-45486-2023.

Mr. Kunal Vinayak, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. N.S. Dadwal, Advocate
for the petitioners in CRM-M-45486-2023 and
for respondent No.2 in CRM-M-45320-2023.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petitions, the petitioners are seeking quashing of cross case registered under Sections 324/323/506/34 IPC (later on offence under Section 201 IPC was added while presenting the challan), registered vide G.D. No.024 dated 30.05.2018 at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana Rural and case FIR No.0084 dated 29.05.2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 452/323/506/149 IPC, at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana Rural, on the basis of panchayati compromise deed dated 24.08.2023 (Annexure P-4).

2. These are matters arising out of version and cross-version.
3. On 13.09.2023, the following order was passed:-

“The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C by the petitioners seeking quashing of cross case registered under Sections 324/323/506/34 IPC later on offence under Section 201 IPC was added while presenting the challan, registered vide G.D. No.024 dated 30.05.2018 at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana Rural in case FIR No.0084 dated 29.05.2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 452/323/506/149 IPC, at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana Rural.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the matter already stands compromised vide compromise (Annexure P-4).

Notice of motion for **18.12.2023**.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Mr.N.S.Dadwal, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 and admits the fact of there being a compromise between the parties.

In view of the above, the parties, i.e. the petitioners as well as respondent No.2 are directed to appear before learned Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court on 26.09.2023. On their doing so, the learned Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court shall record their statements and furnish its report to this Court by the next date of hearing on the following aspects:-

1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the 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.

A copy of the report be also sent to the Registrar Judicial of this Court.

Needless to say that in case for any reason the statements are not recorded on the aforesaid date, the learned Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter.”

4. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 16.12.2023 JMIC, Jagraon has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“XX XX XX

1. There are only four accused in the present FIR as per the statement of the IO namely Babu Lal, Tarsem Lal, Rachna and Shakuntla Devi. Shakuntla Devi had died.
2. None of the accused was proclaimed offender as per the statement of the IO.
3. The compromise is genuine, voluntarily made out of the free will of the parties and without any coercion or undue influence.
4. None of the accused involved in any other criminal case/FIR as per the statement of the IO.
5. There is one victim namely Rashpal Kaur as per the statement of the IO.”

5. Similarly in CRM-M-45486-2023, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“XX XX XX

1. There are only two accused in the present FIR as per the statement of the IO namely Gurmukh Singh and

Rashpal Kaur.

2. None of the accused was proclaimed offender as per the statement of the IO.
3. The compromise is genuine, voluntarily made out of the free will of the parties and without any coercion or undue influence.
4. None of the accused involved in any other criminal case/FIR as per the statement of the IO.
5. There is one victim namely Tarsem Lal as per the statement of the IO.”
6. Counsel appears for respondents in both the cases, admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that they have no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.
7. Similarly learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.
8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.
9. This Court and Apex Court has repeatedly dealt with the issue of exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash proceedings recognizing compromise between parties in non-compoundable offences in the cases of *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another*, 2012(10) SCC 303, *State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan and others* (2019) 5 SCC 688, *Kulwinder Singh & others vs. State of Punjab & another*, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and *Ram Gopal and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh*, 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 322 (Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 decided on 29th of September, 2021). The proposition of law that emerges from the aforesaid decisions rendered by Apex Court and this Court is :

- (a) *Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is much wider and is unaffected by Section 320 of the Code.*
- (b) *However, wider the power greater the caution.*
- (c) *The underlining principle while exercising such power is that it can be invoked to quash the proceedings recognizing compromise between the parties in the matters which are overwhelmingly and predominantly of civil character like commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes.*
- (d) *The said power is not to be exercised in the prosecutions involving heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc. as such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society.*
- (e) *Section 482 Cr.P.C. casts duty upon the High Court to advance interest of justice as well. It is in recognition of this duty casted upon the High Court, that Apex Court held that the High Court would not refuse to quash FIR under Section 307 merely because FIR finds mention thereof. High Court can assess nature of injuries sustained, whether such injuries inflicted on vital/delicate parts of the body/nature of weapons used etc.*
- (f) *Such exercise at the hands of High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected after investigation and chargesheet is filed/charges framed during the trial. Such exercise cannot be carried out while the matter is still under investigation.*
- (g) *While quashing FIR in non-compoundable offences even which are of private in nature, High Court is required to consider antecedents of the accused, conduct of the accused and whether he was absconding or whether he has managed the complainant to enter into a compromise.*

10. Thus, keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise jurisdiction vested u/s 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR as :-

- (i) *The present matter does not fall within the exceptions as carved out in **Laxmi Narayan's** case (supra) i.e. heinous offence.*
- (ii) *The offences alleged are of private nature.*
- (iii) *The parties have compromised.*

- (iv) As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.
- (v) Complainant/victim is reported to have entered into compromise on his own volition.

11. Consequently, the petitions are allowed. cross case registered under Sections 324/323/506/34 IPC (later on offence under Section 201 IPC was added while presenting the challan) registered vide G.D. No.024 dated 30.05.2018 at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana Rural and case FIR No.0084 dated 29.05.2018, registered for offences punishable under Sections 452/323/506/149 IPC, at Police Station Sudhar, District Ludhiana Rural and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

12. A photocopy of this order be placed on the file of other connected case.

18.12.2023
Dinesh

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No