



275

THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.3374 of 2024
Date of Decision: 08.08.2024

Mithun Kaushik
..... Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another
..... Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present: Mr. Gaurav Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Tanuj Sharma, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Gaurav Singla, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ, J. (ORAL)

1. Instant second petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.411, dated 04.12.2013, under Sections 406/420/506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Faridabad Old, Distt. Faridabad (Annexure P-1) along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise effected between the parties. Further prayer has been made for staying the further proceedings with respect to the above mentioned FIR in question during the pendency of the present petition and for directing the



trial Court to release the amount of Rs.3 lacs deposited by the petitioner in compliance of order dated 10.01.2014 in CRM-M-375 of 2014.

2. FIR in question was got registered by complainant-respondent No.2 and the investigation commenced thereon. However, with the intervention of respectables, finally the parties arrived at settlement and they resolved their *inter se* dispute, which is apparent from Compromise Deed, annexed as Annexure P-2. On the basis of the compromise, the petitioner is invoking the inherent power of this Court by praying that continuation of these proceedings would be a futile exercise and an abuse of process of the Court and thus, the FIR in question and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom may be quashed in the interest of justice.

3. This Court vide order dated 23.01.2024 directed the parties to appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording their statements, as contended before the Court, and the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate was also directed to send its report.

4. In pursuance to the same, learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad has sent the report dated 12.04.2024 to this Court. With the report, he has also annexed the original statements of complainant/respondent No.2, namely, Jitender Gupta @ Cheeku and petitioner, namely, Mithun Kaushik recorded on 05.03.2024. He has also annexed the photocopy of statement of PSI Pankaj recorded on 20.03.2024. On the basis of the statements, learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad has concluded in the report that the compromise



effected between the parties is genuine, voluntarily and out of their free will. It has been further mentioned that the accused has not been declared proclaimed person in this case whereas five FIRs under section 174-A of IPC have already been registered against accused-Mithun Kaushik. It has further been mentioned that including abovesaid five cases under Section 174-A IPC, six other FIRs have been registered against Mithun Kaushik and there is no other victim other than the complainant in the present case.

5. It has been submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that as per the order passed by this Court on 10.01.2014, Rs.3 lacs were deposited by the petitioner before the trial Court. He has submitted that it is part of the compromise and mentioned in para No.4 of the same. He submits that the amount of Rs.3 lacs would be refunded to the petitioner and the same be allowed to be withdrawn by the petitioner.

6. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has no objection regarding the same and has fairly submitted that the petitioner be allowed to withdraw the amount.

7. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the record and the report sent by learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad.

8. As far as pendency of other cases against the petitioner is concerned, he will have to face the trial and ultimate decision in said cases. A bare perusal of statutory provision of the 482 Cr.P.C. would show that the High Court may make such orders, as may be necessary to



give effect to any order under this Code or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Section 320 Cr.P.C. is equally relevant for consideration, which prescribes the procedure for compounding of the offences under the Indian Penal Code.

9. Keeping in view the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, the continuation of criminal prosecution would be a futile exercise. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a number of cases including *Narinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466; B.S.Joshi and others vs State of Haryana and another (2003) 4 Supreme Court Cases 675* followed by this Court in Full Bench case of *Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR 1052* have dealt with the proposition involved in the present case and settled the law.

10. Thereafter, Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Gian Singh vs State of Punjab and another (2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases 303* further dealt with the issue and the earlier law settled by the Supreme Court for quashing of the FIR in *State of Haryana vs Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335*. Para 61 of the judgment reads as under:-

“61. 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 a 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 personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, 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 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 the 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 the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

11. Applying the law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in plethora of judgments and this High Court, it is apparent that when the parties have entered into a compromise, then continuation of the proceedings would be merely an abuse of process of the Court and by allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioner by quashing the FIR would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of the legislature enacting under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

12. As a result, this Court finds that the case in hand squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents and hence, FIR No.411, dated 04.12.2013, under Sections 406/420/506 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Faridabad Old, Distt. Faridabad (Annexure P-1) along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioner, namely, Mithun Kaushik on the basis of compromise. Needless to say that the parties



shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

12. The learned trial Court would allow the petitioner to withdraw the amount of Rs.3 lac deposited by him as per direction of this Court.

13. Petition stands allowed.

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

05.08.2024
rittu

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