

279 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-44309-2023
Date of decision : 06.02.2024

GURPREET SINGHPetitioner

Versus

STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHERRespondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Naveen Kumar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Addl. A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Gyan Parkash Saini, Advocate
for respondents No.2(a) and 2(b).

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.278 dated 05.05.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 & 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala, Haryana (Annexure P-1) on the basis of compromise.

2. On 19.10.2023, the following order was passed :-

“xxx

The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No.278 dated 05.05.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 & 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Ambala City, District

Ambala, Haryana and all subsequent proceedings arising thereto on the basis of compromise.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter already stands compromised vide Compromise Deed dated (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion for 06.02.2024.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Gyan Parkash Saini, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2(a) and 2(b) and admits the fact of there being a compromise between the parties.

In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate on 14.11.2023. On their doing so, the learned Illaqa Magistrate/Duty Magistrate 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/Duty Magistrate 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 from CJM, Ambala

dated 28.11.2023 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“2. In view of the statements of the parties, duly identified by their respective counsel, it appeared that the parties have entered into compromise and the said compromise has been arrived at between the parties without any kind of pressure, coercion, and at their sweet will. As such, compromise in question is found to be a valid and genuine compromise and has been effected between the parties voluntarily without there being any kind of coercion or undue influence.

3. It is further respectfully submitted that status report of present case was called from concerned IO/ASI, P.S. Ambala City, which makes it transpired that the present, FIR has been registered against accused Gurpreet Singh. It is further respectfully submitted that no accused was declared proclaimed offender/person in the present case, no other case is pending against the accused, there is no other accused in the present FIR and there is one victim/complainant namely Harbans Singh in the present case, who has expired and now, his LRs namely Avtar Kaur and Didar Singh are complainant in the present case. Challan has not been filed by the police in this case.”

4. Ld. Counsel appearing for respondents No.2(a) and 2(b) 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 are quashed.

5. Similarly Ld. State Counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise.

6. I have heard Ld. 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 Cr.P.C. to quash proceedings recognizing compromise between the 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 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) 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.278 dated 05.05.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 & 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Ambala City, District Ambala, Haryana (Annexure P-1) and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioner.

February 06, 2024		(Pankaj Jain)
Dpr		Judge
Whether speaking/reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No