

271 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-48199-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: January 10, 2024

Harpreet Viridi and another ...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another ...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Vijay Rana, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Mohd. Salim, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J.(Oral)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.58 dated 16.07.2022 under Sections 406 and 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Women Cell, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of Settlement agreement/compromise dated 04.05.2023 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2. On 22.09.2023, the following order was passed:

“The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.58 dated 16.07.2022 under Sections 406, 498-A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Women Cell, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar, and all other consequential

2024:PHHC:002971

proceedings arising there-from, on the ground that the parties have since compromised the matter vide compromise deed dated 04.05.2023 (Annexure P-2).

*Learned counsel for the petitioners would contend that the parties have since entered into a compromise which has been reduced into writing on 04.05.2023. Learned counsel would further contend that pursuant to the compromise, a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 has also been filed wherein first motion statements already stand recorded and part payment stands made. It is further contended that the matter is now fixed for recording of the second motion statements on 23.11.2023. Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon the judgment passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in "**Gian Singh V/s State of Punjab & Anr.**" [2012 (10) SCC 303] and the Larger Bench's judgment of this Court in "**Kulwinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab & Anr.**" [2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052].*

Notice of motion.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG Punjab accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Ms. Monika, Advocate accepts notice for respondent No.2. Copy of the petition has already been supplied to both the counsel.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 states that respondent No.2 would have no objection if the aforesaid FIR is quashed in view of the fact that the parties have since compromised the matter.

List on 19.12.2023.

Meanwhile, the parties are directed to appear before the concerned CJM/Illaq Magistrate/Trial Court on 23.11.2023, or on any other date convenient to the Court, for recording of their statements. The CJM/Illaq Magistrate/Trial Court is

2024:PHHC:002971

directed to record the statements of the parties to its satisfaction qua the genuineness of the compromise and that the same is not the result of any undue influence, coercion or pressure of any kind. A report, along-with the statements of the parties, on the following points be sent to this Court before the next date of hearing :

- 1) Whether the settlement/compromise dated 04.05.2023 (Annexure P-2) has been freely entered into between the parties without any undue influence, coercion or pressure of any kind.*
- 2) Whether any other criminal cases are pending against the parties.*
- 3) Whether any proclamation proceedings are pending against either of the parties.”*

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 29.11.2023 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Jalandhar has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“Both parties have compromised the matter. There is no grudge remain between parties. The compromise is voluntary, without any pressure or coercion.”

4. Learned counsel for respondents 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 is quashed.

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

6 I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and have carefully

2024:PHHC:002971

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 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, 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 wise 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*

2024:PHHC:002971

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 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.*

9. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.58 dated 16.07.2022 under Sections 406 and 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Women Cell, Jalandhar, District Jalandhar and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of Settlement agreement/compromise dated 04.05.2023 (Annexure P-2), is, hereby, quashed qua the petitioners.

January 10, 2024

geeta

Whether reasoned/speaking:
Whether reportable:

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Yes/No
Yes/No