

CRM-M-16041-2023

2024:PHHC:048638

-1-

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

274

CRM-M-16041-2023

Date of Decision : April 09, 2024

Satnam Verma @ Satnam Singh and another

.....Petitioners

VERSUS

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE KULDEEP TIWARI

Present : Mr. Ayush Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Akshay Kumar, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rishab Garg, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

KULDEEP TIWARI, J. (Oral)

1. The instant petition, as cast under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C., proffers the hereinafter extracted relief, as craved by the petitioners, inasmuch as, quashing of the FIR No.253 dated 15.7.2015, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC, registered at P.S. Jodhewal, District Ludhiana City alongwith all consequential proceedings qua the petitioners, on the basis of a compromise dated 9.3.2023 (Annexure P-4), as entered into *inter se* the petitioners and respondent No.2/complainant.

2. Upon an affirmative response from the learned counsel for respondent No.2/complainant *qua* the compromise (Annexure P-4), this Court had, through an order drawn on 12.2.2024, upon the instant petition, besides issuing notice, directed the parties to appear before the

learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate concerned, for getting their respective statements recorded *qua* authenticity of the compromise (Annexure P-4). Moreover, the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate concerned was also directed to send a report in the above regard.

3. Consequent to the making of the directions (*supra*), the parties appeared before the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana and got their respective statements recorded, thereby authenticating the compromise (Annexure P-4). Accordingly, in compliance of the directions (*supra*) of this Court, a Report bearing No.148 dated 3.4.2024 has been received from the learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana, wherein, a satisfaction has been recorded by the Magistrate concerned *qua* the compromise (*supra*) being drawn in a genuine and voluntary and without any pressure or coercion and out of free will of the parties.

4. Though the FIR was registered against five accused, however, during the pendency of the trial, co-accused Kimti Lal had died and proceedings against co-accused Manu Arora @ Jugnu and Nirmala have already been quashed by this Court vide CRM-M-9706-2018 and CRM-M-46409-2018 respectively and now only the present petitioners are facing the trial with whom the sole victim/complainant has entered into a compromise, therefore, it is not a partial compromise, but a complete compromise. The above aspect has been verified by the learned State counsel on instructions imparted to him by the official concerned.

5. This Court have heard counsel for the parties and gone through the case file.

6. A Co-ordinate Bench of this Court, in CRM-M-25669-2020 (O&M), titled “Abhishek Singh & others V/s State of Punjab & others”, Pronounced on: 07.04.2022, while granting a similar relief, as craved in the instant petition, has observed as under:-

“9. The following aspects would be relevant to conclude this petition:-

a) The accused and the private respondents have amicably settled the matter between them in terms of the compromise deed and the statements recorded before the concerned Court;

b) A perusal of the documents reveal that the settlement has not been secured through coercion, threats, social boycotts, bribes, or other dubious means;

c) The victim has willingly consented to the nullification of criminal proceedings;

d) There is no objection from the private respondents in case present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed;

e) In the given facts, the occurrence does not affect public peace or tranquillity, moral turpitude or harm the social and moral fabric of the society or involve matters concerning public policy;

f) The rejection of compromise may also lead to ill will. The pendency of trial affects career and happiness;

g) There is nothing on the record to prima facie consider the accused as an unscrupulous, incorrigible, or professional offender;

h) The purpose of criminal jurisprudence is reformatory

in nature and to work to bring peace to family, community, and society;

i) The exercise of the inherent power for quashing the conviction, sentence and all previous proceedings is justified to secure the ends of justice.”

7. In the light of the hereinabove recorded aspects and considering the fact that the offences, for which the petitioners/accused have been charged, are not of grave in nature, as also in view of the law laid down in *Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543* and *Kulwinder Singh, others Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052*, the present petition for quashing the FIR (supra) is hereby allowed.

8. Resultantly, FIR No.253 dated 15.7.2015, under Sections 420, 465, 467, 468, 471, 120-B of the IPC, registered at P.S. Jodhewal, District Ludhiana City and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, **quashed** on the basis of a compromise dated 9.3.2023 (Annexure P-4), subject to payment of ₹5,000/- to be deposited with the District Legal Services Authority concerned.

(KULDEEP TIWARI)
JUDGE

April 09, 2024
ajay-1

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