

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

302

CRM-M-6790-2024
Date of decision: 12.03.2024

YOGESH KUMAR AND ORS.PETITIONERS
V/s

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHERRESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. S.S. Khurana, Advocate
for the petitoners.

Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Mukesh Kumar Verma, Advocate for
Ms. Jitender Kaur, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

Short reply dated 02.03.2024 in the form of an affidavit of Pawan Kumar, HPS, Deputy Superintendent of Police, City Rewari has been filed on behalf of respondent-State. The same is taken on record. Copy thereof has been supplied to learned counsel for the petitioners.

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.0134 dated 05.07.2021 under Sections 313, 323, 324, 34, 354-A, 406, 498-A, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Rampura, District Rewari and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 13.09.2023 (Annexure P-4), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 09.02.2024, 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.

Ms. Jitender Kaur, 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 19.02.2024 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/Illaq 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.12.03.2024."

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 02.03.2024 from

Additional District and Sessions Judge, Rewari has been received, which is

taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“It is humbly submitted that vide order dated 09.02.2024 passed in CRM-M No.6790 of 2024 the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh directed the Trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to get recorded the statement of the parties regarding compromise and to submit its report. The joint statement of complainant Lalita W/o Yogesh and D/o Sh. Manoj Kumar at present residing at Qutubpur, Ward No.24, Rewari and accused persons, all residents of H.No.16/911, Block H, Bapa Nagar, Karol Bagh, New Delhi has been recorded before me on 27.02.2024 being Trial Court to the effect that they have amicably settled their dispute without any force, compulsion or pressure of any sort. The complainant and her husband Yogesh also filed a petition under Section 13B of Hindu Marriage Act which has been allowed vide order dated 13.09.2023 passed by the Family Court, Rewari. Copy of said order has been submitted on record. As per the parties, there was no pressure, influence, coercion or force upon them in any manner to enter into that compromise and to settle the terms thereof. No other accused was arraigned or wanted in this case. The point wise report as desired is as under:-

- 1. There is no other accused other than the accused named: 1. Vinay S/o Parkash Chand, 2. Pawan Kumar S/o Shiv Raj, 3. Dipali D/o Parkash Chand, 4. Roop Kalan W/o Parkash Chand, 5. Rakhi W/o Vinay, 6. Parkash Chand S/o Lahori Lal and 7. Yogesh S/o Parkash Chand facing trial before this Court and were present while recording the joint statement qua the compromise between the parties.*
- 2. The complainant-Smt. Lalita (wife) alongwith her father was present at the time of recording statement qua the compromise and as per record there is no other complainant or affected party other than her.*
- 3. No accused has been declared proclaimed offender in the case.”*

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 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 petitioners are quashed.

5. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise (Annexure P-4).

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.***

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. 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) 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.*

9. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.0134 dated 05.07.2021 under Sections 313, 323, 324, 34, 354-A, 406, 498-A, 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Rampura, District Rewari and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 13.09.2023 (Annexure P-4), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

March 12, 2024
jatin

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