

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH
310+122

CRM-M-7721-2024
Date of decision: 09.04.2024

SUNDER AND ANOTHER
V/s
....PETITIONERS

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER
....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ankur Jain, Advocate for the petitioners.
Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana.
Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

CRM-15595-2024

Notice in the application.

At the asking of the Court, Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana,
accepts notice for respondent No.1-State of Haryana.

Mr. Kamal Chaudhary, Advocate appears and accepts notice for
respondent No.2.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having
perused the record, the instant application is allowed as prayed for subject to
just exceptions. The petitioner No.3-Vimla and petitioner No.4 Preeti are
directed to be impleaded as party-petitioners to the present petition. The
amended memo of parties be taken on record.

The Registry is directed to carry out requisite correction in the
memo of parties.

CRM-M-7721-2024

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of

registered at Police Station, Ballabgarh City, District Faridabad and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 12.01.2024 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 22.02.2024, the following order was passed:

“The petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG, Haryana, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No 1 State of Haryana and accepts notice.

Mr. Gaurav Verma, Advocate has filed vakalatnama for respondent No. 2. The same be taken on record.

The parties are directed to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise in the following manner:

(i) The petitioners shall appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned on 29.02.2024 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording statement of the petitioners as well as of the complainant qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such appearance is made, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise. It shall be open to the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to either record the statement of the parties by physical process or by video conferencing as deemed appropriate by the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.

(ii) In case the statement is to be recorded by way of video conferencing, the parties concerned shall be duly identified through video conferencing by their respective counsel, subject to the satisfaction of the Presiding Officer.

(iii) The trial Court/Illaq Magistrate may also choose to get the statements of the parties recorded through some Commissioner, appointed by the Court who would be some Advocate having sufficient standing at the Bar. In case the statement is recorded through some Commissioner, such Commissioner/Advocate shall furnish an affidavit after recording statements to the effect that the parties had appeared before him/her and he/she had recorded their statements as per law and that the said parties had been duly identified by their respective counsel. This shall be subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Illaq Magistrate. After recording the statements of all the affected parties in either of the aforesaid manner, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded as to whether all the affected parties have entered into a compromise and as to whether the compromise in question is found to be a valid compromise and

has been effected without there being any kind of influence or coercion.

The trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate shall also report as regards the following facts after seeking information from Investigating Officer, concerned:

(i) Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioners, arrayed in this petition.

(ii) Whether there is any other complainant or affected/ aggrieved party other than the respondents, arrayed in the petition.

(iii) Whether any accused has been declared Proclaimed Offender?

The report be submitted before this Court before the next date of hearing i.e. 02.04.2024.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 16.03.2024 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Faridabad has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1.In reference to the above cited subject. I have the honour to submit that in pursuance to order dated 22.02.2024 passed by Hon'ble High Court, the complainant Nisha @ Savita, accused persons Sunder. Satpal, Vimla and Preeti and Investigating Officer ASI Bhupender appeared before the court and their statements have been recorded. The parties have relied upon their Aadhar card for identification, copies of which are placed on record.

ii. The complainant Nisha @ Savita and the accused persons namely Sunder, Satpal, Vimla and Preeti have suffered their statements that they have settled their disputes amicably with the interference of elders and respectable persons of the society. They have entered into compromise on their sweet will, without any fear or pressure from anyone. They further stated that they have not been declared PO and no such proceedings are pending against them before any competent court of law. Both sides were duly identified by their respective counsels.

Iii) I asked the parties regarding compromise. They stated at bar, in consonance with their statements, that they have settled their dispute by entering into compromise which is acceptable to both of them voluntarily and without any pressure, with intervention of respectable persons of society. They further stated that all incit disputes have been put to rest and they have no grudge against each other. The complainant Nisha @ Savita further submitted that she has no objection if the proceedings of this case qua accused persons are quashed by Hon'ble High Court

As per statement of Investigating Officer ASI Bhupender, initially FIR was registered against two accused namely Satpal Singh and Sunder Singh and during further investigation, other accused persons namely Preeti and Vimla were arrested and joined into investigation. There are four accused namely Sunder, Satpal, Preet and Vimla and the present petition has been filed on behalf of two accused/petitioner namely Sunder and Satpal.

V. As per statement of Investigating Officer ASI Bhupender, there is no other complainant or affected/aggrieved party other than the respondent namely Nisha @ Savita.

vi. As per statement of Investigating Officer ASI Bhupender, there is no proclaimed persons in the present case.

vii. This Court is of the considered view that the compromise appears to be genuine and has been reached voluntarily, without any pressure or undue influence between the complainant namely Nisha @Savita and the accused persons namely Sunder, Satpal, Vimla and Preeti and they have made their statements voluntarily and without any threat, inducement, coercion or undue influence. Hence, the compromise is genuine and voluntary. Statements of the complainant Nisha @ Savita, accused persons Sunder, Satpal, Vimla and Preeti and Investigating Officer ASI Bhupender dated 15.03.2024 are enclosed with the present report in compliance of order of Hon'ble High Court dated 22.02.2024"

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 admits the factum of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.

5. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise/settlement (Annexure P-2).

6. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

7. This Court and the Hon'ble Apex Court has repeatedly dealt with the issue of exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code to quash proceeding in non-compoundable offences in the cases of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(10) SCC 303, Kulwinder Singh & others vs.***

State of Punjab & another, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and Ram Gopal and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 322 (Criminal Appeal No.1489 of 2012 decided on 29th of September, 2021). The proposition of law that emerges from the aforesaid decisions rendered by the Hon'ble Apex Court and this Court is :

- (a) *Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is much wider and is unaffected by Section 320 of the Code.*
- (b) *However, wider the power greater the caution.*
- (c) *The underlining principle while exercising such power is that it can be invoked to quash the proceedings recognizing compromise between the parties in the matters which are overwhelmingly and predominantly of civil character like commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes.*
- (d) *The said power is not to be exercised in the prosecutions involving heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity etc. as such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society.*
- (e) *Section 482 Cr.P.C. casts duty upon the High Court to advance interest of justice as well. It is in recognition of this duty casted upon the High Court, that Apex Court held that the High Court would not refuse to quash FIR under Section 307 merely because FIR finds mention thereof. High Court can assess nature of injuries sustained, whether such injuries inflicted on vital/delicate parts of the body/nature of weapons used etc.*
- (f) *Such exercise at the hands of High Court would be permissible only after the evidence is collected*

after investigation and chargesheet is filed/ charges framed during the trial. Such exercise cannot be carried out while the matter is still under investigation.

(g) While quashing FIR in non-compoundable offences even which are of private in nature, High Court is required to consider antecedents of the accused, conduct of the accused and whether he was absconding or whether he has managed the complainant to enter into a compromise.

8. Learned counsel for the parties, in support of their contentions have relied upon the following judgments :-

- i) Ranjeet Kumar versus State of H.P. & Ors. in case CRM-M-648 of 2023 decided on 08.12.2023 by the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.*
- ii) Arif Khan versus The State and another in case W.P. (CRL) 1064/2023 decided on 09.01.2024 by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi.*
- iii) Sukhchain Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 81.*
- iv) Ananda DV Vs. State and another 2021 SCC Online SC 3423.*

9. Thus, keeping in view the aforesaid facts and circumstances, this Court is of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise jurisdiction vested u/s 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR as :-

- (i) Putting a quietus to the proceedings will bring peace and tranquility amongst parties & will accordingly further the cause of substantial justice.*
- (ii) The offences alleged are primarily of private nature.*
- (iii) As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.*
- (iv) Complainant/victim is reported to have entered into compromise on his own volition.*

10. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.390 dated 13.07.2020 under Sections 323, 34, 354 and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Ballabgarh City, District Faridabad and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 12.01.2024 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

11. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

April 09, 2024
jatin

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