

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

278

CRM-M-5984-2024

Date of decision : 01.04.2024

Mukesh**..... Petitioner****versus****State of Haryana and others****..... Respondents****CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. Vijay Sangwan, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Vikrant Rana, Advocate
for respondents No.2 and 3.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.2 dated 01.01.2022, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 148/149/323/452/506 IPC (Section 25 of Arms Act added later on) at Police Station Urban Estate Rohtak, District Rohtak on the basis of compromise/affidavits dated 18.02.2022 (Annexures P-2 & P-3).
2. Reply by way of affidavit of Vidya Nand, H.P.S., Deputy Superintendent of Police, Sadar, Rohtak on behalf of respondent No.1-State has been filed. The same is taken on record.
3. On 06.02.2024, the following order was passed:-

“The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No.2 dated 01.01.2022, registered for offences punishable under Sections 148/149/323/452/506 IPC (Section 25 of

2024:PHHC:046779

Arms Act deleted later on), at Police Station Urban Estate Rohtak, District Rohtak.

Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter already stands compromised vide Annexure P-2/P-3.

Notice of motion for 01.04.2024.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana. accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Vikrant Rana, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 & 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/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court on 26.02.2024. On their doing so, the learned Duty Magistrate/Illaq 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.

2024:PHHC:046779

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.”

4. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 14.03.2024 from ACJM, Rohtak has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, there are three accused namely Sumit, Vinit and Mukesh. Qua Sumit and Vinit, FIR already stands quashed in CRM-M-14876-2022 vide order dated 26.08.2022. Rest of the accused is petitioner herein. In its report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“XX XX XX

1) Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR?

There are total three accused persons namely Sumit, Vinit and Mukesh in the FIR. Against accused Sumit and Vinit, FIR has already been quashed by the Hon'ble High Court in CRM-M-14876-2022 dated 26.08.2022.

(2) Whether any accused is proclaimed offender?

No.

(3) Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence?

Yes, the compromise arrived at between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

(4) Whether the accused persons are involved in any other case or not?

No.

(5) How many victims/complainants are there in the FIR?

There are two injured in this FIR namely Parveen And Rajender and Parveen is the complainant in this FIR.”

5. Mr. Vikrant Rana, Advocate appears for respondents No.2 & 3 and 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 are quashed.

6. Learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.

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 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

2024:PHHC:046779

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.

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) 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.*

2024:PHHC:046779

(vi) *Though the petitioners already stand convicted yet in view of law laid down by the Apex Court in the case of **Ram Gopal and another vs. State of Madhya Pradesh** (supra), this Court finds it to be a fit case to exercise jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom including the order of conviction.*

10. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.2 dated 01.01.2022, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 148/149/323/452/506 IPC (Section 25 of Arms Act added later on) at Police Station Urban Estate Rohtak, District Rohtak and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

01.04.2024
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No