

282

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-21082-2023
Date of decision : 11.03.2024

HARWINDERJIT SINGH @ SONU AND ANR.Petitioners

Versus

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Surinder Sharma, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. J.S. Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Lovish Rattan, Advocate for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.33, dated 19.03.2008 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 469, 496, 506, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and under Sections 25-27-54-59 of Arms Act, at Police Station Bhogpur, District Jalandhar (Annexure P-1) on the basis of compromise.

2. On 09.08.2023, the following order was passed :-

“The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.33 dated 19.03.2008, registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 469, 496, 506 and 120-B of IPC and Sections 25, 27, 54 and 59 of Arms Act, at Police Station

Bhogpur, District Jalandhar and all subsequent proceedings arising thereto on the basis of compromise.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contends that the matter already stands compromised vide compromise deed dated 01.04.2023 (Annexure P-2).

In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 31.08.2023.

On their doing so, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court/Duty Magistrate shall record their statements and furnish its report to this Court by the next date of hearing on the following aspects:-

1. Number of persons arrayed as accused in the FIR.
2. Whether any accused is proclaimed offender?
3. Whether the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence?
4. Whether the accused persons are involved in any other case or not?
5. The trial Court is also directed to record the statement of the Investigating Officer as to how many victims/complainants are there in the FIR.

A copy of the report be also sent to the Registrar Judicial of this Court.

Needless to say that in case for any reason the statements are not recorded on the aforesaid date, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall be at liberty to call the parties on any other date but not later than a week thereafter.

To come up on 15.11.2023.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report from JMIC, Jalandhar dated 15.09.2023 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“The parties were present with their counsel and got recorded their statements in respect to the compromise taken place between them. All the parties are duly identified by their

counsels.

As per record the name of the complainant of the present case is Amandeep Kaur and except her there is no other complainant in this FIR. The name of the accused person is Gagan Chahal. Except him, there are no other person nominated by the police as accused. As per record, accused person is neither involved in any other case in Jalandhar nor declared proclaimed offender in any other criminal case in Jalandhar. At present, the case is pending for the prosecution evidence.

Both parties have compromised the matter. There is no grudge remain between parties. The Compromise is voluntarily, without any pressure or coercion. This court is of the considered opinion that the compromise has been effected between the complainant and accused and same is voluntary, without any pressure or coercion and is genuine one”

4. Ld. Counsel appearing for respondent No.2 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.

5. Similarly Ld. State Counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise. He has filed status report by way of affidavit of Sumit Sood, PPS, DSP, Sub Division Adampur, Jalandhar, today in Court Court. The same is taken on record.

6. I have heard Ld. Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

7. This Court and Apex Court has repeatedly dealt with the issue of exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash proceedings recognizing compromise between the parties in non-compoundable

offences in the cases of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012(10) SCC 303, State of Madhya Pradesh vs. Laxmi Narayan and others (2019) 5 SCC 688, 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 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) The present matter does not fall within the exceptions as carved out in **Laxmi Narayan's** case (supra) i.e. heinous offence.
- (ii) The offences alleged are 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.33, dated 19.03.2008 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 469, 496, 506, 120-B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and under Sections 25-27-54-59 of Arms Act, at Police Station Bhogpur, District Jalandhar

(Annexure P-1) and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed
qua the petitioners.

March 11, 2024		(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr		Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No