

*CRM-21358-2023 in/and CRA-S-4270-SB-2016
and another connected case*

399 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

DATE OF DECISION:-11.03.2024

1.

CRM-21358-2023 in/and CRA-S-4270-SB-2016

Sukhdev Singh

...Appellant.
- Vs.
- State of Punjab

...Respondent..
2.

CRM-21549-2023 in/and CRA-S-4296-SB-2016

Jagmeet Singh and others

....Appellants
- VS.
- State of Punjab

....Respondent

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA

Present: Mr. Satyam Arora, Advocate
for the appellant(s)(in both the appeals).

Mr. Athar Ahmed, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Harpreet Puri, Advocate for
Mr. C.M. Munjal, Advocate for the complainant.

HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)

CRM-21358-2023 in CRA-S-4270-SB-2016
CRM-21549-2023 in CRA-S-4296-SB-2016

Prayer in both these applications is for placing on record compromise deed dated 21.12.2018 (Annexure A-1), entered into between the parties, and further to decide the main appeals on the basis of compromise by acquitting the appellant(s) besides quashing the FIR as well as cross-version case.

In pursuance of order dated 16.05.2023 (in CRA-S-4270-SB-2016) and order dated 17.05.2023 (in CRA-S-4296-SB-2016) passed by this Court, whereby parties were directed to appear before the Trial Court for getting their statements recorded as regards the veracity of compromise

*CRM-21358-2023 in/and CRA-S-4270-SB-2016
and another connected case*

arrived at between them, separate reports dated 17.07.2023 and 25.07.2023 have been received from the concerned Court in the respective cases, stating that the compromise which has been entered into by the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence.

Accordingly, applications are allowed and compromise deed dated 21.12.2018 (Annexure P-1) are taken on record in the respective files.

Main cases

1. This common judgment of mine shall dispose of above mentioned two appeals as they all involve common question of law and fact. For convenience, the facts are being taken from CRA-S-4270-SB-2016.
2. By way of present appeal(s), challenge has been laid to the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 03.11.2016 passed by the court of learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sri Muktsar Sahib, whereby the appellants were convicted and sentenced to the following effect:-

<i>Sr. No.</i>	<i>Name of accused</i>	<i>Section</i>	<i>Sentence</i>	<i>Fine</i>	<i>In default of payment of fine</i>
1	Sukhdev Singh	308 IPC	RI for 5 years	Rs.25,000/-	06 months
2	Jagmeet Singh	325 IPC	RI for 3 years	Rs.5000/-	03 months
3	Lakhvir Singh @ Lakha	323 IPC	RI for 06 months	Rs.1000/-	01 month

3. Briefly stating, in the present case, appellant(s) were arrayed as accused in case FIR No.46, dated 13.05.2014, registered under Sections 308, 325, 148 and 149 IPC, Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib at the instance of victim/complainant, namely, Harjit Singh, with the averments that the appellant(s) inflicted injuries upon him as well as his brother Gurjeet Singh besides one Davinder Singh with their respective weapons. Finding a prima facie case, charges under Sections 308, 325, 323, 148 read with

**CRM-21358-2023 in/and CRA-S-4270-SB-2016
and another connected case**

Section 149 IPC, were framed against the appellant(s), to which, the accused pleaded not guilty to the charge and claimed trial.

4. The Trial Court vide judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 03.11.2016, convicted and sentenced the appellant(s) as mentioned above.

5. Aggrieved thereof, Sukhdev Singh (appellant) filed CRA-S-4270-SB-2016, whereas Jagmeet Singh & Lakhvir Singh @ Lakha (appellants) filed CRA-S-4296-SB-2016. Both the appeals were admitted and sentence of the appellants was suspended by this Court vide two separate orders dated 19.04.2017 & 11.01.2017 in the respective case.

6. During the pendency of both the appeals, a compromise has been effected between the parties, who happened to be co-villagers. The statements of the parties in this regard have already been recorded before the Trial Court as is evident from aforementioned dated 17.07.2023 and 25.07.2023.

7. In view of the above noted subsequent development, learned counsel for the appellant(s) submits that the parties having settled their disputes in order to bury their differences being co-villagers, the FIR in question be thus, quashed by permitting the parties to compound the offences under Sections 308, 325, 148, 149 IPC. For the said purpose, learned counsel for the appellant(s) places reliance upon judgment of this court passed in “**Kulwinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab**”, 2007(3) RCR (Criminal) 1052 and “**Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another**”, 2012(4) RCR (CrI.)543.

8. In response, learned counsel representing complainant, accepting the factum of compromise deed dated 21.12.2018 (Annexure P-1), raises no

CRM-21358-2023 in/and CRA-S-4270-SB-2016
and another connected case

objection in quashing of the FIR as well as other proceedings arising out of the same.

9. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the paper book.

10. The parties being co-villagers, having settled their disputes so as to maintain peace and harmony and also for the betterment and safety of their generations to come, no useful purpose would be served by proceeding further with the criminal proceedings. In the light of above developments, it is rather in the interest of both the parties to render a complete quietus to the criminal proceedings and thus, in terms of settlement no cause remains for this Court to invest further time and effort in adjudicating this appeal on merits. My aforesaid view is mainly dervied from the proposition of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **“Ram Gopal vs. State of Madya Pradesh**, 2021(4) RCR (Criminal)322. Relevant paras 18 and 19 thereof are reproduced hereunder:-

“18. It is now a well crystalized axiom that the plenary jurisdiction of this Court to impart complete justice under [Article 142](#) cannot ipso facto be limited or restricted by ordinary statutory provisions. It is also noteworthy that even in the absence of an express provision akin to [Section 482 Cr.P.C.](#) conferring powers on the Supreme Court to abrogate and set aside criminal proceedings, the jurisdiction exercisable under [Article 142](#) of the Constitution embraces this Court with scopious powers to quash criminal proceedings also, so as to secure complete justice. In doing so, due regard must be given to the over-arching objective of sentencing in the criminal justice system, which is grounded on the sublime philosophy of maintenance of peace of the collective and that the rationale of placing an individual behind bars is aimed at his reformation.

19. We thus sumup and hold that as opposed to [Section 320 Cr.P.C.](#) where the Court is squarely guided by the compromise between the parties in respect of offences ‘compoundable’ within the

CRM-21358-2023 in/and CRA-S-4270-SB-2016
and another connected case

statutory framework, the extraordinary power enjoined upon a High Court under [Section 482](#) Cr.P.C. or vested in this Court under [Article 142](#) of the Constitution, can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of [Section 320](#) Cr.P.C. Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings, bearing in mind: (i) Nature and effect of the offence on the conscious of the society; (ii) Seriousness of the injury, if any; (iii) Voluntary nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; & (iv) Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations.”

11. Thus, in view of the above as well as keeping in mind the law laid down in the aforementioned judgments, both the appeals are **allowed**. FIR No.46, dated 13.05.2014, registered under Sections 308, 325, 148 and 149 IPC, Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom including the judgment of conviction and order of sentence dated 03.11.2016, are hereby **set aside** qua the appellant(s), on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties on 21.12.2018 (Annexure A-1) resultantly, appellants-accused stand **acquitted** subject to payment of costs of Rs.50,000/- to be deposited by the appellants with Poor Patient Welfare Fund, PGIMER, Chandigarh, within a period of two weeks from the date of receipt of certified copy of this order.

Pending application(s), if any, shall also stands disposed of.

11.03.2024
sonika

(HARKESH MANUJA)
JUDGE

whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No
whether reportable: Yes/No