

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-36955 of 2022

DATE OF DECISION :- 16.02.2024

Harinderjit Singh

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present:- Ms. Dolli Sharma, Advocate
for Mr. Jagtar Singh Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Yuvraj Singh Tiwana, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Prabhjot Singh Mann, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No. 16 dated 19.01.2020 under Sections 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station, Women, District Patiala and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 07.03.2022 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 22.08.2022, the following order was passed:

“The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No.16 dated 19.1.2020 under Sections 498-A I.P.C., registered at Police Station, Women, District Patiala and subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise dated 7.3.2022 (Annexures P-2).

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that parties have amicably settled their dispute and they have arrived at a compromise.

Counsel submits that prosecution of the petitioner in the present FIR is nothing but an abuse of the process of law.

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Arun Luthra, D.A.G., Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr. P.S. Mann, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.2.

Learned counsel for respondent no.2 has endorsed the contention raised by learned counsel for the petitioner and has not denied the factum of compromise effected between the parties.

Adjourned to 1.12.2022.

In the meanwhile, both the parties are directed to appear before the concerned Illaqa/Duty Magistrate on 19.9.2022 for recording their statements, who shall record their respective statements with regard to the genuineness/correctness of the compromise and that the compromise is not the result of any fraud or misrepresentation and is the result of free will of the parties. It would also be verified that besides the accused (petitioner) mentioned in the petition, there is no other accused in the FIR and the parties are not involved or declared proclaimed offender in any other criminal case.

The Illaqa/Duty Magistrate shall send his/her report through learned Sessions Judge concerned on or before the date fixed before this Court.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 23.12.2022 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Patiala has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“In compliance of the above-mentioned Order, statement of complainant Ranjit Kaur and accused Harinderjit Singh have been recorded. Complainant Ranjit Kaur has stated that she has lodged the present FIR against the said accused on the basis of application. He further stated that the matter has been compromised with the accused with their own free will, without any pressure.

Similarly, accused Harinderjit Singh has suffered statement that the matter has been compromised between him and complainant.

Statement of IO/ASI Baljinder Singh No.1413/PTA, Women Cell, Patiala also recorded, in which he stated that there is only one accused in the present case i.e. Harinderjit Singh. He further stated that no PO proceedings pending against the accused of the present FIR in this case or any other case. There is only one complainant in the present case i.e. Ranjit Kaur. Also the accused is not involved in any other FIR.

The perusal of FIR reveals that the present case has been registered on the basis of application moved by complainant Ranjit Kaur against accused. From the statements of the parties, it appears to the Court that, Ranjit Kaur complainant has effected compromise with accused Harinderjit Singh and the compromise is result of free will of parties and is not result of any fraud or any misrepresentation and it is genuine. Also, there is only one accused in the present case i.e. Harinderjit Singh and the parties are not involved or declared proclaimed offender in any other criminal case.”

4. Learned counsel 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 petitioner 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, 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) Putting a quietus to the proceedings will bring peace and tranquility amongst parties & will accordingly further the cause of substantial justice.
- (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. 16 dated 19.01.2020 under Sections 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station, Women, District Patiala and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 07.03.2022 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

16.02.2024

P.Singh

Whether speaking/reasoned

Yes/No

Whether Reportable

Yes/No