

281 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-36347-2023

Date of decision : 18.01.2024.

SHUBHAM SUMAN AND ORS.

....PETITIONERS

V/S

STATE OF PUNJAB AND OTHERS

.....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Zorawar S Chauhan, Advocate  
for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Jitender K. Sehrawat, Advocate  
for respondents No.2 and 3.

\*\*\*\*\*

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

1 By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.180 dated 07.07.2023 registered under Sections 323/341/506/34 IPC, (Section 324 IPC added later on) at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar Rural and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

2 On 28.07.2023, 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.180 dated 07.07.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 506 and 34 of IPC, at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar Rural 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 14.07.2023 (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion for 12.10.2023.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab, who is present in Court accepts notice on behalf of the respondent-State.

Mr. Bhuwan Vats, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf

of respondents No.2 and 3 and admits the fact of there being compromise between the parties.

In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 04.09.2023.

On their doing so, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court 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. ”

3 Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 22.09.2023 from Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Phillaur has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“i) As per report of Investigating Officer, ASI Jaswinder Singh No. 398/Jalandhar, P. S. Phillaur, FIR was registered against three persons namely, Shubham Suman, Mukaljeet and Ricky Kumar by complainant Rakesh Kumar

ii). As per report of Investigating Officer, ASI Jaswinder Singh No. 398/Jalandhar, P. S. Phillaur, accused persons have not been declared as Proclaimed Offender in this case.

iii). The compromise effected between the parties appears to be genuine and voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. Statements of parties were duly recorded before the undersigned and they were duly identified by their respective counsel.

iv). As per report of Investigating Officer, ASI Jaswinder Singh No. 398/Jalandhar, P. S. Phillaur, the accused persons are not involved in any other case.

v) As per report of Investigating Officer, ASI Jaswinder Singh No. 398/Jalandhar, P. S. Phillaur, in this case, there is one complainant namely, Rakesh Kumar and only one injured/aggrieved namely, Ranjit Masih.”

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, 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 recognizing compromise between 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 29<sup>th</sup> 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 wiser 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.180 dated 07.07.2023 registered under Sections 323/341/506/34 IPC, (section 324 IPC added later on) at Police Station Phillaur, District Jalandhar Rural and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

18.01.2024  
*smriti*

(PANKAJ JAIN)  
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes  
Whether reportable : No