

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

270

CRM-M-60204-2022

Date of Decision : 23.03.2023

Rijwan and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHOK KUMAR VERMA

Present : Mohd. Jameel, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Gurpreet Singh Sandhu, D.A.G., Punjab
for respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Suman Kumari, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

ASHOK KUMAR VERMA, J. (ORAL)

The petitioners have filed the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.132 dated 22.11.2021 registered under Section 379 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (to which Sections 411, 419, 467, 468, 471 of the IPC were added later on) at Police Station City-II Malerkotla, District Malerkotla (**Annexure P-1**) and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 12.12.2022 (**Annexures P-2**) effected between the private parties.

Pursuant to order dated 22.12.2022 passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court, the parties had appeared before learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Malerkotla to get their statements recorded. Learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Malerkotla

submitted her report along with copies of statements of the parties vide letter dated 10.03.2023 through learned District and Sessions Judge, Sangrur which is taken on record.

I have heard learned Counsel for the petitioners, learned State Counsel and learned counsel for respondent No.2 and gone through the relevant record.

It is now well settled that the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings in non-compoundable cases on the basis of settlement between the parties for securing the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process where the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case. Criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character particularly those arising out of commercial transaction or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family dispute can be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire dispute among themselves. However, such power cannot be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape dacoity, etc. which are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, prosecution for offences alleged to have been committed under special enactments like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servant while working in that capacity cannot be quashed on the basis of compromise

CRM-M-60204-2022

3

between the victim and the offender. For judicial precedents in this regard, reference may be made to *Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another : 2012(4) RCR Criminal) 543, Narinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab (Supreme Court) : 2014 (2) RCR (Criminal) 482, State of Madhya Pradesh Vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (Supreme Court) : 2019 (2) RCR (Criminal) 255 and Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and others (Punjab and Haryana High Court) : 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052.*

According to the report, learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Malerkotla is satisfied that compromise effected between the parties is genuine, outcome of free consent of the parties and is without coercion from any quarter.

Considering the report dated 10.03.2023 of learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Malerkotla and the fact that the compromise will bring peace and harmony between the parties, aforesaid FIR No.132 dated 22.11.2021 (**Annexure P-1**) and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are quashed, qua the petitioners only.

Disposed of, accordingly.

(ASHOK KUMAR VERMA)
JUDGE

23.03.2023
Kothiyal

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether reportable	Yes/No