

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

245

CRM-M-39854-2019

Date of Decision: 23.07.2024

Jatinder Singh @ Tinda and others

.... Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and others

.... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NIDHI GUPTA

Present: - Ms. Satpreet Grewal Kapila, Advocate for the petitioners.


Ms. Rishu Madan, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Rahul Garg, Advocate for respondents No. 2 and 3.

NIDHI GUPTA, J. (ORAL)

Prayer in the instant petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is for quashing of FIR No. 292 dated 08.12.2017 (Annexure P-2) registered under Sections 363, 366-A and 120-B IPC (Section 376 IPC added later on) at Police Station Sadar Patiala, District Patiala and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 13.09.2019 (Annexure P-8) arrived at between the parties.


Pursuant to the order dated 19.09.2019 passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court, the parties have appeared before the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Patiala, to get their statements recorded. Learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Patiala, has submitted her report along with copies of statements of the parties vide letter dated 16.11.2019 duly forwarded by the learned District and Sessions Judge, Patiala.



A perusal of the above said report would show that the parties have appeared before the learned trial Court and suffered statements with respect to the compromise which have been found to be genuine, voluntary, without any threat or coercion.

Learned counsel for the petitioner, *inter alia*, submits that the petitioner No. 1-Jatinder Singh @ Tinda and the victim/respondent No. 3 herein were in a consensual relationship. They both after running away from their houses have solemnized marriage on 08.12.2017, as is evident from marriage certificate dated 08.12.2017 (Annexure P-1), therefore, no offence, as alleged in the FIR, has been committed. Thereafter, petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 3-victim have also filed a protection petition bearing CRM-M-15486-2018, before this Court which was disposed of by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 18.04.2018. One girl child was also born out of the said wedlock on 23.07.2018 and they are residing happily together. The present FIR lodged by complainant/respondent No. 2, as petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 3 have solemnized marriage against her wishes. Now better sense has prevailed between the parties and in order to live peacefully, parties have entered into compromise dated 13.09.2019 (Annexure P-8), according to which, both the parties have agreed not to proceed further with the FIR in question. Learned counsel submits that petitioners are the only accused in the present FIR and they have never been declared as proclaimed offender(s).

Learned counsel for the State as well counsel for respondents No. 2 and 3 have not disputed the aforesaid submissions of




learned counsel for the petitioner and pleaded 'no objection' in case the FIR is quashed on the basis of compromise qua the petitioner.

This Court has heard the learned counsel for the parties and has perused the file.

After perusing the report submitted by the learned trial Court, this Court finds that the matter has been amicably settled between the petitioners and respondents No. 2 and 3. Since the matter has been settled and the parties have decided to live in peace, this Court feels that in order to secure the ends of justice, the criminal proceedings deserve to be quashed.

In normal circumstances, the Court would not entertain a matter when the non compoundable offences are heinous in nature and against the public. In the instant case, the offences complained of, are under Section 376 IPC which no doubt is offence of grave nature and the Courts should not in the ordinary circumstances interfere and quash the FIR that has been registered. However, there are always exceptions to the normal rules and certain categories of cases, which deserve consideration specially when it is case of love affair between teenagers. In the instant case, the petitioner No. 1 and the victim/respondent No. 3 herein were in consensual relationship and now they have solemnized marriage with each other and also blessed with a girl child on 23.07.2018. Moreover, with the intervention of respectables, a compromise has also been entered into between them whereby it is decided by respondents No. 2 and 3 that the FIR would not be pursued.

The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of *Narinder Singh*



and others vs. State of Punjab and another, 2014(6) SCC 466, has laid down certain principles and guidelines which should be kept in mind while quashing of FIRs pertaining to non- compoundable offence. For ready reference paragraphs No.29.2 and 29.5 are reproduced as under :-


“29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure : (i) ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case.”

Even in a judgment rendered by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Madan Mohan Abbot vs State Of Punjab, 2008 (4) SCC 582*, it has been held that it is advisable that in disputes where the question involved is of a purely personal nature, the Court should ordinarily accept the terms of the compromise even in criminal proceedings. Relevant paragraph of the said judgment is reproduced herein below :-

“5. It is on the basis of this compromise that the application was filed in the High Court for quashing of proceedings which has been dismissed by the impugned order. We notice from a reading of the FIR and the other documents on record that the dispute was purely a personal one between two contesting parties and that it arose out of extensive business dealings between them and that there was absolutely no public policy involved in the nature of the allegations made against the accused. We are, therefore, of



the opinion that no useful purpose would be served in continuing with the proceedings in the light of the compromise and also in the light of the fact that the complainant has, on 11th January 2004, passed away and the possibility of a conviction being recorded has thus to be ruled out.

6. *We need to emphasize that it is perhaps advisable that in disputes where the question involved is of a purely personal nature, the Court should ordinarily accept the terms of the compromise even in criminal proceedings as keeping the matter alive with no possibility of a result in favour of the prosecution is a luxury which the Courts, grossly overburdened as they are, cannot afford and that the time so saved can be utilized in deciding more effective and meaningful litigation. This is a common sense approach to the matter based on ground of realities and bereft of the technicalities of the law.*

7. *We see from the impugned order that the learned Judge has confused a compounding of an offence with the quashing of proceedings. The outer limit of Rs.250/- which has led to the dismissal of the application is an irrelevant factor in the later case. We accordingly allow the appeal and in the peculiar facts of the case, direct that FIR No.155 dated 17th November 2001 P.S. Kotwali, Amritsar and all proceedings connected therewith shall be deemed to be quashed.”*

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in **“Kulwinder Singh and others Vs State of Punjab”, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, it is held that High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the proceedings where the High Court is of the opinion that the same is required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of **“Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another”, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543**, had also observed that in order to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of



process of Court, inherent power can be used by this Court to quash criminal proceedings in which a compromise has been effected. The relevant portion of para 57 of the said judgment is reproduced here-in-below:-

“57. 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 view of what has been discussed here-in-above, this petition is **allowed** and FIR No. 292 dated 08.12.2017 (Annexure P-2) registered under Sections 363, 366-A and 120-B IPC (Section 376 IPC added later on) at Police Station Sadar Patiala, District Patiala and all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 13.09.2019 (Annexure P-8) arrived at between the parties, are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners.

23.07.2024
rishu

(NIDHI GUPTA)
JUDGE

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