

HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

261-CRM-M-61008-2022

Date of Decision: 09.01.2023

SURJEET SINGH @ SURJIT SINGH AND OTHERS ... Petitioners

VS.

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SANDEEP MOUDGIL

Present: Mr. GS Bhinder, Advocate for the petitioner

Mr. Mohit Chaudhary, AAG Punjab

Mr. PK Kishanpuri, Advocate for respondent No.2

Sandeep Moudgil, J. (Oral)

(1) This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of GD No.36 dated 07.10.2018 (Annexure P1) in FIR No.107 dated 01.10.2018 under Sections 325/323/148/149 IPC, registered at Police Station Sujampur, District Pathankot (Annexure P2) with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 27.02.2019 (Annexure P3).

(2) During the pendency of the dispute, the parties have compromised the matter. Vide order dated 04.01.2023, parties were directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court and for report with regard to the genuineness of the compromise.

(3) The report dated 07.01.2023 has been received from learned JMIC, Pathankot stating that the parties have entered into a compromise without any undue influence or pressure.

(4) The Hon'ble Full Bench of this Court in case **Kulwinder Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052** and Hon'ble

Division Bench of this Court in case **Sube Singh and another vs. State of Haryana and another, 2013(4) RCR (Criminal) 102** observed that compounding of offence can be allowed even after conviction, during proceedings of the appeal against conviction pending in Sessions Court and in case of involving non-compoundable offence.

(5) The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh Versus 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 2 of 4 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 predominatingly 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 3 of 4 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."

(6) The same view has been reiterated by Hon'ble the Apex Court in case **Narinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(2) RCR (Criminal) 482.**

(7) It is evident that in view of the amicable resolution of the issues amongst the parties, no useful purpose would be served by continuation of the

proceedings. The furtherance of the proceedings is likely to be wastage of judicial time and sheer abuse of process of law.

(8) In view of above, the prayer made in the present petition is allowed and the above-mentioned GD (Annexure P1) in FIR (Annexure P2), and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioners in view of compromise (Annexure P3).

(9) Disposed off.

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

09.01.2023

V.Vishal

1. Whether speaking/reasoned?

2. Whether reportable?

(Sandeep Moudgil)
Judge

Yes/No

Yes/No