

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

278

CRM-M-37447-2023
Date of decision: 13.03.2024

DEEPINDER SINGH AND OTHERS.

....PETITIONERS

V/s

STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

....RESPONDENTS

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ajaivir Singh, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Yuvraj Singh Tiwana, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Premjit Singh Hundal, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.264 dated 19.07.2008 under Sections 406, 498-A, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Phase I, Mohali and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of settlement (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 30.01.2024, the following order was passed:

“CRM-42963-2023

For the reasons stated in the application and in view of the submissions made by learned counsel for applicant-petitioners, the application in hand is allowed, as prayed for subject to all just exceptions. The amended memo of parties annexed with the application is taken on record.

CRM-M-37447-2023

*The petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties.
Notice of motion.*

At this stage, Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG, Punjab, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State and accepts notice.

Mr. Premjit Singh Hundal, Advocate has appeared on behalf of respondent No. 2.

The parties are directed to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise in the following manner:

(i) The petitioners shall appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned on 05.02.2024 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording statements of the petitioners as well as of the complainant qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such appearance is made, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise. It shall be open to the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to either record the statements of the parties by physical process or by video conferencing as deemed appropriate by the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.

(ii) In case the statement is to be recorded by way of video conferencing, the parties concerned shall be duly identified through video conferencing by their respective counsel, subject to the satisfaction of the Presiding Officer.

(iii) The trial Court/Illaq Magistrate may also choose to get the statements of the parties recorded through some Commissioner, appointed by the Court who would be some Advocate having sufficient standing at the Bar. In case the statement is recorded through some Commissioner, such Commissioner/Advocate shall furnish an affidavit after recording statements to the effect that the parties had appeared before him/her and he/she had recorded their statements as per law and that the said parties had been duly identified by their respective counsel. This shall be subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.

After recording the statements of all the affected parties in either of the aforesaid manner, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded as to whether all the affected parties have entered into a compromise and as to whether the compromise in question is found to be a valid compromise and has been effected without there being any kind of influence or coercion.

The trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall also report as regards the following facts after seeking information from Investigating Officer, concerned:

(i) Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioners, arrayed in this petition?

(ii) Whether there is any other complainant or affected/

aggrieved party other than the respondents, arrayed in the petition?

(iii) Whether any accused has been declared Proclaimed Offender?

The report be submitted before this Court before the next date of hearing i.e. 13.03.2024.”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 12.03.2024 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, SAS Nagar, Mohali has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“I have the honour to submit with respect to the subject cited above that vide order dated 30.01.2024 passed by the Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court. Chandigarh the petitioner, as well as, complainant were directed to appear before the trial Court/lllaqa Magistrate on 05.02.2024 any date thereafter, as fixed by the trial Court/lllaqa Magistrate for recording their statements qua the factum of compromise and trial Court was directed to submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded as to whether all the affected parties have entered into a compromise and as to whether, the compromise in question is found to be valid compromise and has been effected there being any kind of influence or coercion. It is submitted that in the above noted case, the statements of the parties were recorded, whose names are detailed as under:-

- 1. Complainant Gulkhushboo wife of Deepinder Singh, R/o House No.300. Dashmesh Nagar, Naya Gaon whose statement was recorded on 27.02.2024.*
- 2. Statements of petitioners/accused Deepinder Singh son of Late Sh. Hakam Singh, Gurinder Singh son of Late Sh. Hakam Singh, Satvinder Kaur wife of Late Sh Hakam Singh, R/o House No.16, New Friends Colony Tohana Fatehabad, Haryana were recorded on 27.02.2024. It was also recorded that accused Hakam Singh son of InderSingh died on 19.01.2023 and his death certificate Ex.C2 was placed on record.*
- 3 Inspector Ranbir Singh Sandhu No.49/RR, posted at PS as SHO PS Naya Gaon, SAS Nagar, Mohali recorded his statement on 11.03.2024 as the IO ASI Rajinder Singh has been transferred.*

The report is submitted as under

- (1) As per the report of the Inspector Ranbir Singh Sandhu, there are only four accused i.e. Deepinder Singh of Hakam Singh, Satwinder Kaur wife of Hakam Singh, Hakam Singh son of Inder Singh and Gurinder Singh son of Hakam Singh arrayed in this FIR.*
- (2) As per the report of the Inspector Ranbir Singh Sandhu, there is only one complainant i.e. Gulkhushboo wife of*

Deepinder Singh arrayed in the petition. (3) As per the report of the Inspector Ranbir Singh Sandhu, there is no accused declared as Proclaimed Offender, In view of the statement of complainant and three accused persons, I am of the opinion that the compromise of parties has been effected as per compromise deed Ex.C1 which was referred to by the parties during their statements. Further, as per the statements of the parties annexed with this report, the compromise appears to be genuine, correct and voluntary and so entered into by the parties without any pressure, threat, coercion from anyone & out of their own will. Therefore, in my opinion, the present FIR may kindly be quashed against the petitioners/accused Deepinder Singh son of Hakam Singh, Satwinder Kaur wife of Hakam Singh and Gurinder Singh son of Hakam Singh on recount of compromise between the parties (one accused namely Hakam Singh has already expired)."

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 petitioners are quashed.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has handed over two demand drafts bearing Nos.520665 of Rs.20 lacs and demand drafts bearing No.520666 of Rs.20 lacs (total Rs.40 lacs) to learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 in Court today. A zerox copy of the same be kept on record.

6. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the settlement (Annexure P-2).

7. I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

8. This Court and the Hon'ble 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 the Hon'ble 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.*

9. 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.*

10. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.264 dated 19.07.2008 under Sections 406, 498-A, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station, Phase I, Mohali and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of settlement (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

March 13, 2024
jatin

Whether speaking/reasoned:	Yes/No
Whether reportable:	Yes/No