

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

117+267

CRM-18326-2024 in/and
CRM-M No.12019 of 2023
Date of decision: 30.04.2024

Sunil Kumar
State of Punjab and another

Versus

.... Petitioner
.... Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present : Mr. Sahil Bansal, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Ravinder Singh, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Gurmeet Kaur Dhillon, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

CRM-18326-2024

The application is allowed, as prayed for and the certificate of marriage dated 09.10.2022 is taken on record.

Main Case

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No.0236 dated 06.10.2022 registered under Sections 376, 342, 506 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Dharmkot, District Moga, on the basis of compromise dated 28.02.2023 (Annexure P-2).
2. Shorn of unnecessary details, the facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR had been registered on the basis of a written complaint filed by

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:060719

respondent No. 2/complainant 'M' (*name withheld*) alleging therein that she was aged about 23 years and used to perform in the songs. She came in contact with the petitioner and he assured her to get more work as he claimed to be known to several directors. In that process, the petitioner took her to a flat at Kharar on the pretext of arranging a meeting of the complainant with some director. However, he insisted her to have physical relation with him, to which, the complainant refused. The petitioner took off her clothes forcibly and started making video and by extending threat that he would make that video viral, he ravished the complainant against her wish. Thereafter, on 29.08.2022, the petitioner again took her to his flat and kept her in his custody since 04.09.2022 and during that period, he kept on ravishing her forcibly. She was also extended beatings by the petitioner. The complainant even became pregnant but she was asked by the petitioner to abort her pregnancy. At one point of time, the petitioner even assured to perform marriage with her but did not do so. She was repeatedly ravished by him. Therefore, she prayed for taking action against him. On the basis of these allegations, FIR was registered and investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner submitting that a compromise has been arrived at between the respondent No. 2/complainant and himself. The complainant has performed marriage with the petitioner on 09.10.2022. No useful purpose would be served by keeping the criminal proceedings pending against the petitioner as chances of his conviction are remote and bleak. Therefore, it is urged that the petition deserves to be allowed.

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:060719

4. It will not be out of place to mention here that learned counsel for respondent No.2 has also affirmed the fact that a compromise has been arrived at between the respondent No. 2/complainant and the petitioner and marriage between them has been performed and they are living happily together. She has submitted that the respondent No.2 has no objection, if the FIR is quashed.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer of the petitioner by arguing that the petitioner has been booked for commission of offences punishable under Sections 376, 342, 506 and 120-B of IPC which are quite serious in nature and offence under Section 376 IPC falls within the category of heinous crime. The compromise between the parties is not permissible in law. By submitting that the petition is misconceived and cannot be allowed, he has urged that the same is liable to be dismissed.

6. It will also relevant to mention here that vide order dated 22.03.2023, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court on 10.04.2023 for recording their statements with regard to the compromise. The trial Court was directed to submit report in the matter. A report has been submitted by the trial Court as per which the statements of the petitioner and respondent No.2 had been recorded on 10.04.2023 and the statement of the Investigating Officer had been recorded on 03.07.2023. As per the trial Court, the statements have been recorded without any pressure, undue influence and coercion and the parties have voluntarily recorded their statements.

7. There are catena of judgments of Hon'ble Supreme Court whereby, parameters governing the exercise of jurisdiction of Section 482 of

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:060719

the Code of Criminal Procedure are well settled. In a celebrated judgment cited as *State of Haryana Vs. Bhajan Lal, 1992 SUPP (1) SCC 335*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has discussed different categories of cases wherein, the power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. could be exercised either to prevent abuse of process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice, while observing that it might not be possible to lay down any precise, clearly defined, sufficiently channelized, inflexible guidelines or rigid formulae and to give an exhaustive list or myriad kind of cases where such powers should be exercised. The following principles have been culled out:-

- “102 (1) Where the allegations made in the First Information Report or the complaint, even if they are taken at their face value and accepted in their entirety do not prima facie constitute any offence or make out a case against the accused;
- (2) Where the allegations in the First Information Report and other materials, if any, accompanying the FIR do not disclose a cognizable offence, justifying an investigation by police officers under Section 156(1) of the Code except under an order of a Magistrate within the purview of Section 155(2) of the Code;
- (3) Where the uncontroverted allegations made in the FIR or complaint and the evidence collected in support of the same do not disclose the commission of any offence and make out a case against the accused;
- (4) Where the allegations in the FIR do not constitute a cognizable offence but constitute only a non-cognizable offence, no investigation is permitted by a police officer without an order of a Magistrate as contemplated under Section 155 (2) of the Code;
- (5) Where the allegations made in the FIR or complaint are so absurd and inherently improbable on the basis of which no prudent person can ever reach a just conclusion that there is sufficient ground for proceeding against the accused;
- (6) Where there is an express legal bar engrafted in any of the provisions of the Code or the concerned Act (under which a criminal proceeding is instituted) to the institution and continuance of the proceedings and/or where there is a specific provision in the Code or the concerned Act, providing

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:060719

efficacious redress for the grievance of the aggrieved party;

(7) Where a criminal proceeding is manifestly attended with mala fide and/or where the proceeding is maliciously instituted with an ulterior motive for wreaking vengeance on the accused and with a view to spite him due to private and personal grudge.”

8. Reference can also be made to *Narinder Singh and Ors. Vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466*, wherein the Hon’ble Supreme Court had observed that while exercising power under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., the High Court has to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction of accused is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put him into great oppression and prejudice and injustice would be caused to him by not quashing criminal case.

9. It is also considered to be important to mention here that the inherent power given to High Court under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. is with the purpose and object of advancement of justice. The touchstone for exercising that power would be to secure the ends of justice. The ends of justice are higher than the ends of mere law though justice has got to be administered in accordance with the law enacted by the Legislature. The concept of justice is elastic and imperceptible. There can be no hard and fast line constricting the power of the High Court to do substantial justice. The restrictive construction of inherent powers under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. may lead to rigid or specious justice, which in the given facts and circumstances of a case, may instead lead to grave injustice. Nonetheless such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing proceedings, bearing in mind, the nature and effect of the offence on the consciousness of the society; the seriousness of the injury, if any; voluntary

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:060719

the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence or other relevant considerations. Reference in this regard can be made to a recent judgment of High Court of Kerala pronounced on 16.11.2023 in CrI. MC No.7497 of 2023, *Kahar and others v. State of Kerala and others*, wherein it was observed that the viability of quashing a criminal proceeding on the ground that the accused and victim of sexual assault settles the dispute, resolves ultimately around the facts and circumstances of each case and no straitjacket formula can be formulated. It was further observed that where the High Court has such facts on record which clearly exhibit that the criminal prosecution involving non-compoundable sexual offences against women and children will result in greater injustice to the victim, its closure would only promote her well being, and the possibility of a conviction is remote, it can indubitably evaluate the consequential effects of the offence beyond the body of an individual and thereafter adopt a pragmatic approach and very well decide to quash such proceeding upon a compromise between the accused and the victim after taking into account all relevant facts.

10. On considering the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case as noted above, while keeping in view the well established position of law coupled with the reasons aforementioned and the fact that the matter stands amicably settled between the parties and they have recorded their statements to that effect before the trial Court, I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case for exercising inherent jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 of the Code, so as to secure the ends of justice and the quashing of FIR would be for the welfare of the parties.

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:060719

11. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No.0236 dated 06.10.2022 registered under Sections 376, 342, 506 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Dharmkot, District Moga along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

30.04.2024
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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