

270 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-32412-2023 (O&M)  
Date of Decision: January 10, 2024

Rohan Sehgal and others ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another ...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL**

Present: Mr. Pankaj Bains, Advocate for the petitioners.

Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Damanpreet Singh, Advocate for  
Mr. Jaswant Singh, Advocate for respondent No.2.

\*\*\*\*

**SUMEET GOEL, J.(Oral)**

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.9 dated 26.01.2020 under Sections 323, 406 and 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Kalka, District Panchkula and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise deed dated 30.05.2023 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 20.07.2023, the following order was passed:

**“CRM-28859-2023**

*This is an application for preponing the date of hearing of the main case.*

2024:PHHC:002946

*Notice of the application.*

*Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Chirag Suri, Advocate has filed his vakalatnama on behalf of respondent No.2, which is taken on record. They state that they have no objection if the application is allowed.*

*In view of the above, the application is allowed and with the consent of counsel for the parties, the main case (CRM-M-32412-2023) is taken on Board today itself.*

**CRM-M-32412-2023**

*The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.9 dated 26.01.2020 under Sections 323, 406, 498-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Kalka, District Panchkula Haryana and all other consequential proceedings arising there-from on the ground that the parties have since compromised the matter vide compromise deed dated 30.05.2023 (Annexure P-2).*

*Learned counsel for the petitioners would contend that the parties have since compromised the matter and have resolved all their disputes. It is further the contention that the compromise has been effected before the Mediation and Conciliation Center at Kalka and the compromise deed dated 30.05.2023 has been appended with the present petition as Annexure P-2. Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgment by the Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in "**Gian Singh V/s State of Punjab & Anr.**" [2012 (10) SCC 303] and the Larger Bench's judgment of this Court in "**Kulwinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab & Anr.**" [2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052].*

*Notice of motion.*

2024:PHHC:002946

*Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. Chirag Suri, Advocate has filed his vakalatnama on behalf of respondent No.2, which is taken on record. Copy of the petition has already been supplied to both the counsel.*

*Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 has stated that the parties have voluntarily entered into a compromise and that the compromise is annexed as Annexure P-2 with the petition. He further states that respondent No.2 has no objection if the aforesaid FIR is quashed.*

*List on 24.11.2023.*

*Meanwhile, the parties are directed to appear before the concerned CJM/Illaq Magistrate/Trial Court on 16.08.2023, or on any other date convenient to the Court, for recording of their statements. The CJM/Illaq Magistrate/Trial Court is directed to record the statements of the parties to its satisfaction qua the genuineness of the compromise and that the same is not the result of any undue influence, coercion or pressure of any kind. A report, along-with the statements of the parties, on the following points be sent to this Court before the next date of hearing :*

- 1) Whether the settlement/compromise dated 30.05.2023 (Annexure P-2) has been freely entered into between the parties without any undue influence, coercion or pressure of any kind.*
- 2) Whether any other criminal cases are pending against the parties.*
- 3) Whether any proclamation proceedings are pending against either of the parties.”*

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 30.08.2023 from

2024:PHHC:002946

Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Kalka has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

*“The compromise arrived between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. Petitioners have not been declared proclaimed offenders and no other case is pending against the petitioners.”*

4. Learned counsel for respondents 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 is quashed.

5. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated 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 Apex Court has repeatedly dealt with the issue of exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code to quash proceeding 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 :

2024:PHHC:002946

- (a) *Power u/s 482 Cr.P.C. vested with this Court is much wise 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 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.9 dated 26.01.2020 under Sections 323, 406 and 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Kalka, District Panchkula and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise deed dated 30.05.2023 (Annexure P-2), is, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.
10.           Pending miscellaneous application, if any, shall stands disposed of accordingly.

January 10, 2024

*geeta*

Whether reasoned/speaking:  
Whether reportable:

(SUMEET GOEL)

JUDGE

Yes/No  
Yes/No