

260

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

**CRM-M No. 57349 of 2022 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 31.01.2023**

Jaspreet @ Deepu

..... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

..... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present: Mr. Jasdeep Singh Bhullar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harjinder Singh Sidhu, Addl. AG, Punjab.

Mr. K.S. Aulakh, Advocate for
Mr. Harsimrat Rai, Advocate
for respondent no.2.

HARSH BUNGER J. (ORAL)

CRM No.1403 of 2023

By way of filing the instant application, petitioner has sought permission of this Court to add Section 325 IPC in the head note as well as prayer clause of the main petition i.e. CRM-M No. 57349 of 2022, as the above said Section has been added by the police vide GD No.40 dated 07.09.2022, which was not in the knowledge of the applicant-petitioner and inadvertently could not be mentioned at the time of filing the petition.

Application is allowed, as prayed for subject to all just exceptions.

Registry is directed to carry out necessary corrections in the

CRM-M No. 57349 of 2022

This petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No.139 dated 25.07.2022 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 452, 323, 120-B read with Section 34 IPC and lateron added Section 325 IPC by the police vide GD No.40 dated 07.09.2022, registered at Police Station Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 05.11.2022 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Vide order dated 08.12.2022 of this Court, the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sri Muktsar Sahib, has submitted a consolidated report, vide letter dated 12.01.2023, 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 -

1. *There are five persons arraigned in the FIR as accused and four persons are unknown and only one accused namely Jaspreet @ Deepu is found involved during investigation.*
2. *The FIR/case is still under investigation and only Jaspreet @ Deepu has joined the investigation and*

remaining four persons are unknown;

- 3. As per record and statement of investigating officer, none of the accused persons has been declared as proclaimed offender;*
- 4. As per record and statement of investigating officer, no other case is pending against the accused;*
- 5. Accused Jaspreet @ Deepu and complainant have duly signed the compromise deed;*
- 6. The compromise effected between the parties appears to be genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence; and*
- 7. As per the statement of Investigating Officer, only one complainant / victim is in the present FIR.*

- 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 appearing 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 entire facts, compromise arrived at between the parties, statements of the parties recorded before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and also report dated 12.01.2023, submitted by the Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sri Mukatsar Sahib, 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 above-mentioned 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 petitioners, would be securing the ends of justice.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed. FIR No.139 dated 25.07.2022 (Annexure P-1), under Sections 452, 323, 120-B read with Section 34 IPC and lateron added Section 325 IPC by the police vide GD No.40 dated 07.09.2022, registered at Police Station Sadar Sri Muktsar Sahib, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed *qua* the petitioner herein only.

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.

31.01.2023
mkkoundal

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No

Whether reportable : Yes/No