

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

253

CRM-M-12947-2024
Date of decision: 15.07.2024

GURINDER SINGH

....PETITIONER

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Ms. Komal Preet Kaur, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Arora, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Singh Tiwana, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Jagdeep Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Krishan Singh Dadwal, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.8 dated 11.01.2024 under Sections 498-A, 406 of IPC, registered at Police Station Model Town, Hoshiarpur and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 12.02.2024 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2 On 01.05.2024, the following order was passed:

“Mr. Krishan Singh Dadwal, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2- and has filed his memo of appearance. The same is taken on record. He has further stated that he has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed on the basis of compromise dated 12.02.2024. The parties and Investigating Officer are directed to appear before the Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate on 04.06.2024 or any other future date as per its convenience or on request of the parties for getting their statements recorded with regard to the compromise. However, it is made clear that no further adjournment shall be granted to the parties for that purpose. The Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate shall submit the report on or before the next date of hearing. The report be forwarded to this Court specifying the following:-

1. The number of accused arraigned in the FIR and how many have appeared before it and have made statements and whether any accused is absconding/proclaimed persons, in the case;

2. the name of the complainant and injured/aggrieved and whether all of them have appeared and made their statements in support of the compromise;
3. the stage of trial/proceedings pending;
4. if the compromise is genuine, voluntary and out of free will of the parties.
5. Whether any other criminal case pending against the accused.
Report of Illaqa/Duty Magistrate be awaited for 15.07.2024.
Statement of Special Power of Attorney holder of petitioner- Jaswant Singh, respondent no.2 and investigating officer may be recorded before the Court concerned and statement of the petitioner may be recorded through video conferencing facility on the date fixed.
Vakalatnama be also filed on behalf of respondent no.2 on the next date of hearing.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 01.07.2024 from Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Hoshiarpur, has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1. As per the statement of investigating officer ASI Balwinder Kaur No.1370/Hpr., there is one accused namely Gurinder Singh arraigned in the FIR who appeared before the court and no accused is absconding/proclaimed person in this case.
2. The name of complainant is Ramandeep Kaur, who appeared in the court and got recorded her statement in support of compromise.
3. As per the statement of the investigating officer, challan has not been presented in the present case.
4. As per the statement of the parties, the compromise seems to be genuine, voluntary and out of free Will of the parties.
5. As per the statement of investigating officer no other case is pending against accused/petitioner.”

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 admits the factum 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.

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

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

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. (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 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.8 dated 11.01.2024 under Sections 498-A, 406 of IPC, registered at Police Station Model Town, Hoshiarpur and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 12.02.2024 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

July 15, 2024
jatin

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