

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:059512

IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

284

CRM-M-34846-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 30.04.2024

Namrata Batra

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Haryana and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA

Present:- Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Baljinder Singh, Advocate
for respondent No. 2.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure for quashing of FIR No. 190 dated 30.06.2021, registered under Sections 306 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Sadar Kheripul, District Faridabad (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 07.07.2023 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.
2. The aforementioned FIR had been lodged by respondent No.2/complainant and investigation was commenced thereon.
3. It is submitted by counsel for the petitioner that a compromise has been arrived at between the parties and they have resolved their *inter se* dispute, which was reduced into writing as compromise dated 07.07.2023, annexed with the present petition as Annexure P-2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has placed reliance upon *Ajay Sharma @ Ajay Kumar Sharma vs.*

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:059512

State of Punjab and another : 2024 (1) RCR (Criminal) 641, Kashish @ Parshant and others vs. State of Punjab and another : (Law Finder Doc Id # 2360286) and Arsh Vikram Singh vs. State of Punjab and others : 2022 (4) Law Herald 2897, wherein coordinate Benches of this Court have quashed the FIR registered under Section 306 of IPC on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties, in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of process of Court.

4. On the basis of the compromise arrived at between the parties, the petitioner has prayed for quashing of the aforesaid FIR and all the subsequent proceedings on the ground that continuation of such proceedings would be a futile exercise.

5. This Court vide order dated 11.03.2024 had directed the parties to appear before the Illaqua Magistrate/trial Court for recording their statements with regard to the genuineness of the compromise stated to have been arrived at between them. The Illaqua Magistrate/trial Court was also directed to send his/her report along with the said statements.

6. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Faridabad has sent report vide endorsement No. 271 dated 05.04.2024 to this Court along with the statements of the petitioner, respondent No. 2 as well as the Investigating Officer SI Narender Kumar, recorded on 01.04.2024.

7. On the basis of these statements, it is submitted by learned Magistrate that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, out of free Will and without any pressure or coercion. It is also mentioned in the report that apart from the petitioner, there is no other accused in the FIR and she has not been declared a proclaimed offender/person in this case.

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:059512

8. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and besides perusing the report by learned Judicial Magistrate, have also perused the record.

9. The Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Amalendu Pal v. State of West Bengal(2010) 1 SCC 707*** has held that in order to bring a case within the provision of Section 306 IPC, there must be a case of suicide and in the commission of the said offence, the person who is said to have abetted the commission of suicide must have played an active role by an act of instigating or by doing a certain act to facilitate the commission of suicide. Mere harassment without any positive action on the part of the accused proximate to the time of occurrence which led to the suicide would not amount to an offence under Section 306 IPC. In ***Chitresh Kumar Chopra v. State (Government of NCT of Delhi)(2009) 16 SCC 605***, it was held by Hon'ble Supreme Court that abetment by a person is when a person instigates another to do something. Instigation can be inferred where the accused had, by his acts or omission created such circumstances that the deceased was left with no option except to commit suicide. Similar view has been taken by a coordinate Bench of this Court in ***State of Punjab vs. Kamaljit Kaur alias Bholi and another***, reported as ***2008(2) RCR (Criminal) 562***. Reference can also be made to ***Gangula Mohan Reddy vs. State of Andhra Pradesh*** reported as ***(2010) 1 Supreme Court Cases 750***, wherein Hon'ble Supreme Court has held that abetment involves a mental process of instigating a person or intentionally aiding a person in doing of a thing. Without a positive act on the part of the accused to instigate or aid in committing suicide, conviction cannot be sustained. The intention of the Legislature and the ratio of the cases decided by this court is clear that in

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:059512

order to convict a person under Section 306 IPC, there has to be a clear *mens rea* to commit the offence. It also requires an active act or direct act which led the deceased to commit suicide seeing no option and this act must have been intended to push the deceased into such a position that he committed suicide.

10. The ratio of law as laid down in aforementioned judgments as well as in the judgments relied upon by the petitioner, when applied to the peculiar facts of the present case, would clearly show that in the present case offence under Section 306 IPC is not made out and even on merits, the FIR and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, deserve to be quashed.

11. It is well settled that the High Court has power to quash the prosecution under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. where it feels that the same is required to prevent the abuse of process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Such power is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone. In this regard, reference can be made to a Full Bench judgment of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052***. It is equally settled position of law that the power of High Court in quashing criminal proceedings or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation. Such power can certainly be exercised in cases relating to offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. The High Court is required to consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate to

Neutral Citation No. 2024:PHHC:059512

put an end to the criminal case and if the answer to such question is in affirmative, then the High Court is well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings. Reference in this context can be made to Hon’ble Apex Court judgments cited as *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543* and *Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466*.

12. In view of the proposition as settled in the aforementioned cases, this Court finds that continuation of proceedings would be an abuse process of the Court in the facts and circumstances of the present case which squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents and that allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioner by quashing of the FIR would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of legislature enacted under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 190 dated 30.06.2021, registered under Sections 306 and 34 of the IPC at Police Station Sadar Kheripul, District Faridabad (Annexure P-1) and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioner on the basis of the aforesaid compromise.

13. Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and statements as recorded before learned Judicial Magistrate.

30.04.2024
Waseem Ansari

(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned
Whether reportable

Yes/No
Yes/No