

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

283

CRM-M No.14732 of 2023
Date of Decision: 16.04.2024

Surjit Singh ... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present: Ms. G.K. Maan, Sr. Advocate,
with Mr. Anmol Jeevan Singh Gill, Advocate,
Ms. Simrat Kaur, Advocate and
Mr. Gursharan Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioner.

Mr. Amandeep Singh Samra, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Komal Balain, Advocate,
for respondent No.2.

MANISHA BATRA, J.(Oral)

1. The instant petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No.0110 dated 22.09.2022 registered under Sections 376 and 506 of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 (For short “Act, 1989”) at Police Station Division 3, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar. The petition had originally been filed for quashing of FIR on merits but now the petition is being treated as a petition seeking quashing of FIR on the basis of compromise.
2. Brief facts of the case relevant for the purpose of disposal of this petition are that the aforementioned FIR was registered on the basis

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:052469

of statement recorded by the complainant "J" (name withheld) alleging therein that she had done 10+2 and one year computer course. She alleged that in the year 2003, she came at Jalandhar for search of job. Through newspaper, when she came to know about the requirement of Computer Operator in the office of Railway Road Expert Pictures, 195 Railway Road, Jalandhar, she went there and the owner of the company i.e. the present petitioner kept her on job on a salary of Rs.2500/- per month as a Computer Operator. She alleged that after six months, the present petitioner told her to increase her salary. After three years, the petitioner started paying Rs.7000/- per month and in the year 2013, her salary was increased to Rs.13000/- per month. She alleged that one day when she was late in the night, she stayed in the office and in the morning when she took bath and got ready, then the present petitioner came there and told her that he prepared a movie while she was taking bath and showed her in his mobile. She got scared. The present petitioner said that if the complainant want to get delete this picture then she would have to develop physical relations with him. Due to fear, she agreed and had gone to his house with him. Nobody was present in his house and the petitioner developed physical relations with her against her wishes and kept her there for two days and about 3-4 times he had made relations with her but the petitioner had not deleted her movie and till March 2021, the petitioner blackmailed the complainant and made illicit relations and the petitioner had not let her marry anywhere. The petitioner threatened her, during that period She went to Shimla and Kashmir with the petitioner many times. The petitioner maintained illicit relations with her and threatened her that she is a daughter of Adharmi, Chamariye and she cannot harm him.

Therefore, she prayed for taking action against the petitioner. After

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:052469

registration of FIR, investigation proceedings were initiated.

3. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner on the grounds that a compromise has been effected between the respondent No.2 and himself. They are major. 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.

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 effected between the respondent No.2 and the petitioner. She has submitted that the respondent No.2 has no objection, if the FIR is quashed and affidavit in this regard duly sworn by respondent No.2 has been placed on record as Annexure P-5.

5. Learned State counsel has opposed the prayer of the petitioner by arguing that the chargesheet has been filed against the petitioner for commission of offences punishable under Sections 376 and 506 of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of Act, 1989. The offence under Section 376 IPC is serious in nature and falls within the category of heinous crime. The compromise between the parties is not permissible in law. While stressing that the petition is misconceived, he has urged that the same is liable to be dismissed.

6. It will also be relevant to mention here that vide order dated 16.02.2024 passed by this Court, the parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court on 18.03.2024 for recording their statements with regard to the compromise/settlement. The trial Court was directed to submit its report. A report has been submitted by the trial Court as per which the

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:052469

statements of the respondent No.2-complainant and the present petitioner had been recorded on 18.03.2024 and the statement of Investigating Officer had been recorded on 01.04.2024. It is also reported that the trial Court was satisfied that the compromise between the parties was genuine and without any undue influence.

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

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:052469

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 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

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:052469

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 nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; and conduct of 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

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:052469

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.

11. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No.0110 dated 22.09.2022 registered under Sections 376 and 506 of IPC and Sections 3 and 4 of Act, 1989 at Police Station Division 3, District Police Commissionerate, Jalandhar along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner.

16.04.2024
manju

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

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