

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH

284

CRM-M-46718-2023  
Date of decision : 31.01.2024

Malkit Singh @ Dungri and others

....Petitioners

Versus

Pardeep Singh and others

...Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present : Mr. J.S. Mehal, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Gobind Singh Randhawa, Advocate  
for respondent Nos.1 & 2.

Mr. Kunal Vinayak, AAG, Punjab  
for respondent No.3.

\*\*\*\*\*

**PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)**

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of Complaint No.COMI/02/2017 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 452, 326, 323, 324, 427, 148 and 149 of IPC, 1860 titled as “Pardeep Singh vs Malkit Singh etc. instituted on 22.12.2016, pending in the Court of JMIC, Baba Bakala Sahib, District Amrtisar and all subsequent proceedings arising thereto on the basis of compromise dated 01.08.2023 (Annexure P-2).

2. On 13.10.2023, 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

2024:PHHC:022831

of Complaint No.COMI/02/2017, under Sections 452, 326, 323, 324, 427, 148 and 149 of IPC, 1860 titled as 'Pardeep Singh vs. Malkit Singh etc. instituted on 22.12.2016, pending in the Court of JMIC, Baba Bakala Sahib, District Amritsar 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 (Annexure P-2).

Notice of motion for 31.01.2024.

Mr. Gobind Singh Randhawa, Advocate appears on behalf of respondents No.1 and 2 and admits the fact of there being compromise between the parties and Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.3-State.

In view of the above, the parties are directed to appear before learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on 08.11.2023.

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/Complaint
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/complaint.

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 from JMIC, Baba Bakala Sahib, District Amritsar dated 04.12.2023 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1. From the statement of the IO, there are only six persons arraigned as accused in the COMI/02/2017 namely Malkit Singh @ Dungri, Jasbir Singh @ Babby, Tejinder Singh @ Jatinder Singh @ Tota, Balwinder Singh @ Binda, Gurwinder Singh and Vikramdip Singh @ Bikramjit.

2. From the statement of the IO, none of the accused has been declared P.O.

3. From the statements of the parties, it appears that the settlement is genuine and is arrived at without any coercion or undue influence.

4. As per statement of IO, the accused persons are not involved in any other case.

5. From the statement of IO, Pardeep Singh, Baljit Singh are the only complainants in the present COMI/02/2017.”

4. Counsel appearing for respondent Nos.1 & 2 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that he has no objection in case the Complaint and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the petitioners are quashed.

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

6. I have heard 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 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 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. Complaint No.COMI/02/2017 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 452, 326, 323, 324, 427, 148 and 149 of IPC, 1860 titled as “Pardeep Singh vs Malkit Singh etc. instituted on 22.12.2016, pending in the Court of JMIC, Baba Bakala Sahib, District Amrtisar and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioners.

(PANKAJ JAIN)  
JUDGE

31.01.2024  
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes  
Whether reportable : No