

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

CRM-M-59683-2022

Date of Decision: 15.02.2023

MANU GOYAL

....Petitioner

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARSH BUNGER

Present : Mr. Nitin Sherwal, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Harjinder Singh Sidhu, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Priyanka Kansal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

HARSH BUNGER, J. (Oral)

This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.30 dated 18.03.2019 (Annexure P-1) under Sections 406 and 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Dhakoli, District S.A.S. Nagar and all the consequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of Compromise Deed dated 05.12.2022 (Annexure P-2).

Vide order dated 21.12.2022, the Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court was directed to record the statements of the parties with regard to the genuineness and validity of the compromise.

In compliance thereof, the Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Dera Bassi has submitted a consolidated report, vide letter dated 10.02.2023 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:-

“(i) As per the statement of the Investigating Officer and as per record only Manu Goyal is arrayed as accused.

(ii) As per record the case is pending for prosecution evidence.

(iii) As per information of the Investigating Officer and record none of the accused is declared Proclaimed Offender.

(iv) As per information of the Investigating Officer as per record of P.S. Dhakoli accused is not involved in any other case.

(v) As per record all the concerned have signed the compromise deed.

(vi) As per the statements recorded by the parties, this Court is of considered opinion that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, valid, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

(vii) As per information of the Investigating Officer only complainant Swarna Rani Garg is the victim/complainant in the FIR”

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 the complainant has further endorsed his no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. They have further stated that the compromise arrived at between them is genuine, voluntary and without any pressure.

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 concerned persons and would help in bringing out peace and amity between the parties.

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

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

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.

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 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-dominatingly 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.”

It is pertinent to mention here that even otherwise, offence punishable under Sections 406 and 420 are compoundable under the provisions of Section 320 Cr.P.C.

Considering the entire facts, compromise, the statements of the parties recorded before the Illaqa Magistrate / Trial Court and also the report dated 10.02.2023 submitted by Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Dera Bassi 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 FIR 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.30 dated 18.03.2019 under Sections 406 and 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Dhakoli, District S.A.S. Nagar 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 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.

15.02.2023
pry

(HARSH BUNGER)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No