

**134 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH****CRM M-44449-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 19.01.2024**

Makhanjit Singh and others

.....Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHUPresent: Mr. Ramandeep Singh, Advocate,
for the petitioners.

Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, Sr. DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Praagbir S. Dhindsa, Advocate,
for respondents No.4 to 8.**MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU. J.**

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of DDR No.19 dated 13.09.2028 (**P1-A**) registered under Sections 323, 324, 506 and 148 read with Section 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short, '*the IPC*') (Section 326 IPC added later on) in FIR No.118 dated 13.09.2018 (**P-1**) under Sections 323, 324, 506 and 148 read with Section 149 IPC, at Police Station, Jodhan, District Ludhiana along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 15.05.2023 (**P-2**) entered into between the parties i.e. petitioners as well as respondents No.4 to 8.

2. Allegations are that petitioners formed an unlawful assembly and in furtherance of their common object, caused injuries on the person of Taran Singh, Sukhdev Singh, Jagdev Singh and Krishna Devi.

3. This Court, while issuing notice of motion, on 06.09.2023, passed the following order:-

“Contends inter alia that matter has been compromised between the parties.

(2) Notice of motion.

(3) On asking of the Court, Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1/State.

(4) Mr. Praagbir S. Dhindsa, Advocate, who is present in the Court, has filed Power of Attorney on behalf of respondents No.4 to 8. The same is taken on record. He acknowledged the factum of compromise dated 15.05.2023 (P-2) arrived at between the parties at their own level.

(5) Requisite number of copies of the petition be supplied to learned Counsel for the respondents during the course of day.

(6) Petitioner shall file an affidavit that there is no other criminal case(s) pending against him and also give the details of any other FIR(s), already quashed on the basis of compromise.

(7) In view of the above, let parties appear before the Court of

learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 21.09.2023 for recording their statement(s) with reference to the compromise, if any, entered into between them.

(8) Learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall record the statement(s) of all accused, complainant/injured and victim, if any, and submit a report to this Court before the next date of hearing containing the following information:-

(i). Whether the statements of the parties are bona fide and not result of any pressure or coercion etc. in any manner?

(ii). Whether the compromise effected between the parties is genuine and valid?

(iii). Whether all the accused, complainant and injured are party to the compromise and if not, the details/particulars of such person(s)?

(iv). Whether any other case is pending against either of the parties or not, if yes, the details thereof?

(v). Whether any of the persons involved in this case/dispute has been declared a proclaimed offender?

(vi). Whether any of the petitioner(s) is/are previous convict or not?

(9) List before this Court on 20.10.2023 for further consideration.

(10) Meanwhile, learned State Counsel shall also get the instructions in the matter as to whether the State has any objection?

(11) Copy of this order be sent to learned Judicial Officer concerned forthwith for information and strict compliance”

4. In terms of aforesaid order, the statements of both the parties were recorded by learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Ludhiana and submitted a report dated 11.01.2024. The operative part of the same reads as under:-

“It is humbly submitted that from the statements so recorded of the complainant Makhanjit Singh, Lakhwinder Kaur, Prince Bawa & Sukhpal Singh and accused/petitioner in the present FIR has not been declared as proclaimed offender as per their statement. It is further, humbly submitted that the statements of the parties so recorded, I am of the view that a valid and genuine compromise has been effected between the parties. The aforesaid compromise appears to be genuine one and also appears to be entered into without any pressure or undue influence of any kind.”

5. A perusal of the aforesaid report clearly reveals that the matter has been compromised by both the parties with their free consent, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. Even before this Court also, there is no objection by either of the parties against the compromise.

6. Learned State Counsel, on instructions from the police official present in the Court, also submitted that they have no objection in case the aforesaid FIR as well as consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis of the compromise effected between the parties.

7. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303, has held as under:-

“61. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus : the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz. : (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the 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. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal

proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

8. In view of the above, this Court is fully convinced that the offence(s) are entirely personal in nature and do not affect any public peace or tranquility. Thus, quashing of the DDR in question along with consequential proceedings, on the basis of compromise would bring peace and harmony to secure the ends of justice.

9. Consequently, present petition is allowed; aforesaid FIR along with all consequential proceedings resulting therefrom are quashed qua the petitioners. However, as a deterrence for the future, petitioners shall bear costs of Rs.45,000/- (Rs. 5,000/- each). Costs be deposited with Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association, A/C No. 65035682434, IFSC: SBIN0050306 maintained with State Bank of India, Punjab & Haryana High Court Branch, Chandigarh.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

19.01.2024
SN

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether Reportable: Yes/No