

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

**CRM-M-51809-2022
Date of Decision: 20.01.2023**

Gurpreet Singh

..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and others

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Inderpal Singh Parmar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

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

Mr. Amarpreet Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

Present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is filed for quashing of FIR No.65 dated 10.04.2022 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 177 & 420 IPC and Section 12 of the Passport Act, registered at Police Station Tibba, Police Commissionerate Ludhiana, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of Compromise Deed dated 24.06.2022 (Annexure P-3).

It has been stated by learned counsel for the petitioner that FIR (Annexure P-1) is an outcome of matrimonial dispute between the petitioner and respondent No.2 and in the absence of any proof of marriage, the petitioner had applied for renewal of his passport, showing himself to be

“Manjit Kaur @ Randeep Sidhu @ Sonika Sharda Vs. State of Punjab and others”, 2022 (2) Law Herald 1163, wherein it has been stated as under:-

13. Since the offence under Section 177 of IPC, does not, prima facie, appear to be so grave and nor is so heinous, so as to attract the rigour of the embargo (supra) foisted upon the High Court in verdict (supra). Therefore, the settlement/compromise, as validly entered into, enjoins its being revered. Consequently, even if the afore offence is non-compoundable, this Court does not deem it fit to accept the contention(s) of the learned State counsel, that this Court, may not through recouring the mandate of Section 482 Cr.P.C., quash the FIR. In aftermath when rather thereupons, the chances of the petitioners being convicted are remote as well as bleak. In sequel, the ordering for the trial of the accused, would result in harassment and humiliation, being caused to the accused, besides would defeat the ends of justice.

Vide order dated 11.11.2022, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, has submitted a consolidated report, accompanied by copies of statements of all the concerned parties as well as Investigating Officer, vide letter dated 02.01.2023, which indicates that the parties appeared before the

Magistrate and got recorded their respective statements with regard to the validity of the compromise. As per the report, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine and with free will and consent. Relevant extract of the said report is reproduced as under:

“ - x - x - x -

As desired, the report is as follows:-

- 1. As per record statement of Investigating Officer, FIR No.65/2022 at PS Tibba, Ludhiana was registered against accused person, namely Gurpreet Singh so of Satpal Singh.*
- 2. As per report of Ahlmad, challan has not been presented till date.*
- 3. As per statement of IO, accused person, namely Gurpreet Singh, has not been declared proclaimed offender at any stage of the case as per record available.*
- 4. As per statement of IO, no other criminal proceedings are pending against accused person, namely Gupreet Singh, as per record available.*
- 5. The compromise deed, i.e. Ex. C1, has been signed by both the parties to the compromise and both the parties have identified their signatures in their respective statements made.*
- 6. From perusal of the separate statements made by both the parties, they admitted the genuineness of compromise arising between them. Both the parties have been identified by the respective Ld. Counsels. Perusal of the statement of the parties recorded regarding the compromise between the parties, it appears to the court that the compromise appears to be genuine, voluntary and without any coercion of undue influence.*
- 7. Further, as per statement made by Investigating Officer, there is only one complainant/Victim in*

the present case, i.e. Kanchan Singh.

- x - x - x - ”

A perusal of the said report would show that statements of the concerned persons have been recorded in the case, who have stated that the matter has been compromised and they have no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. They have further stated that the said compromise arrived at between them is genuine, voluntary and without any pressure.

Learned State counsel does not raise any serious dispute regarding quashing of the FIR in question.

Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has again reiterated that the matter has been settled and the said compromise is in the interest of all the persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the parties.

I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the file.

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of “**Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another**”, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543 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 personnel 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.”

In “***Shakuntala Sawhney Vs. Kaushalya Sawhney***”, 1979 (3) ***SCR 639, at P 642***, Hon'ble Supreme Court observed that the finest hour of Justice arises propitiously when parties, who fell apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship or reunion.

Considering the aforementioned facts, compromise arrived at between the parties, statements of the parties recorded before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and also report dated 02.01.2023, submitted by the Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, since the parties have arrived at a compromise by amicably settling their disputes and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose will be served in allowing the criminal proceedings to continue.

Further, in the light of the abovementioned judicial precedents, when the parties have entered into a compromise then continuation of the proceedings would be mere an abuse of process of the Court.

In order to prevent unnecessary continuation of criminal proceedings on the ground that there are bleak chances of conviction in the case, I am of the considered view that it would be in fitness of things to quash the proceedings on the basis of compromise and by quashing the FIR while accepting the prayer of the petitioner, would be securing the ends of justice.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.65 dated

10.04.2022 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 177 & 420 IPC and Section 12 of the Passport Act, registered at Police Station Tibba, Police Commissionerate Ludhiana and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed qua the petitioner. However, the same would be subject to payment of costs of Rs.10,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with the **“Poor Patients' Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh”** and the said amount would be spent for the treatment of poor patients within the knowledge of its Medical Superintendent.

Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms of compromise and their statements made in the Court below.

All pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

20.01.2023*Apurva***(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE**

1. Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
2. Whether reportable : Yes/No