

Arora, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.2 and 3 and admits the fact of there being a compromise between the parties.

In view of the above, both the parties are directed to appear before learned Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 26.02.2024. On their doing so, the learned Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall record their statements and furnish its report to this Court by the next date of hearing on the following aspects:-

- 1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR.*
- 2. Whether any accused is proclaimed offender?*
- 3. Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.*
- 4. Whether the accused persons are involved in any other case or not.*
- 5. The trial Court is also directed to record the statement of the Investigating Officer as to how many victims/complainants are there in the FIR.*

A copy of the report be also sent to the Registrar Judicial of this Court.

Needless to say that in case for any reason the statements are not recorded on the aforesaid date, the learned Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter. ”

3 Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 05.03.2024 from District and Sessions Judge, Kapurthala has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“I have the honour to submit that in accordance with order dated 05.02 2024, of the Hon'ble High Court, the statements of Petitioner Gurpreet Singh (a Gopi S/o Joga Singh @ Mangal Singh and Respondents Gagan Verma a Gagan Kumar S/o Hira and Ravi Verma S/o Hira Lal have been recorded. Even statement of Investigation officer SI Lakhvir Singh 186/Kpt also recorded regarding the quires sought by the Hon'ble High Court. The report is submitted for kind perusal as directed;

1. *There are live accused mentioned in the FIR.*
- 2 *There is no accused who is proclaimed offender.*
3. *The compromise effected in between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.*
4. *There is one more case pending against accused Navjit Singh, whereas there two more cases pending against accused Davinder Singh. whereas on more case pending against accused Dilbagh Singh @ Baga.*
5. *Gagan Verma is only victim/complainant and Ravi Verma is the eye-witness. Both has been impleaded as Respondent No.s in the petition.”*

4 The aforesaid report reveals that there are total **five** accused persons.

5 Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioner is quashed.

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

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

8 This Court and Apex Court has repeatedly dealt with the issue of exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash proceedings recognizing compromise between parties in non-compoundable offences in the cases of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(10) SCC 303, State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (2019) 5 SCC 688, 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 Apex Court and this Court is :

(a) *Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is much wide and 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.*

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) *The present matter does not fall within the exceptions as carved out in **Laxmi Narayan's** case (supra) i.e. heinous offence.*
- (ii) *The offences alleged are of private nature.*
- (iii) *The parties have compromised.*
- (iv) *As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.*
- (v) *Complainant/victim is reported to have entered into compromise on his own volition.*

10 Since the parties are *ad idem* that the compromise/settlement has to be read strictly *inter se* between the parties to the present petition and the complainant wants to pursue prosecution of rest of accused, and it is only accused-petitioner who has approached this Court by way of present petition, the present petition is being entertained and allowed *qua* him only.

11 The question raised by State counsel as to whether the FIR can be quashed in part or not already stands answered by Apex Court in '**Lovely Salhotra and another vs. State (NCT of Delhi)**' reported as (2018) 12 SCC 391, wherein it was observed as under:-

“xx xx xx

We have taken into account the facts of the matter in question as it appears to us that no cognizable offence is made out against the appellants – herein. The High Court was wrong in holding that the F.I.R. cannot be quashed in part and it ought to have appreciated the fact that the appellants - herein cannot be allowed to suffer on the basis of the complaint filed by Respondent No.2 – herein only on the ground that the investigation against co-accused is still pending. It is pertinent to note that the

learned Magistrate has opined that no offence is made out against co-accused Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 6 prima facie.”

12 Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.03 dated 15.01.2017 registered under Sections 379-B, 34 of IPC (Section 411 of IPC added later on) at Police Station Dhilwan, Kapurthala and all proceedings arising therefrom are hereby partially quashed *qua* the petitioner.

08.04.2024
spn

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

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