

134

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-51105-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 25.01.2024

JAGDEEP SINGH
Vs.
STATE OF HARYANA AND ANOTHER

.. Petitioner

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Ketan Antil, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Surender Singh Pannu, Addl. A.G., Haryana.
Mr. Rajiv Rathor, Advocate for Mr. J.S. Thakur, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

...

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.351 dated 09.09.2021 registered under Sections 323, 342, 354, 498-A and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 34 IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Barauda, District Sonipat and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 24.09.2023 (Annexure P-2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.
- 2 On 10.10.2023, the following order was passed:

“This is a petition under Section 482 Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.351 dated 09.09.2021 registered under Sections 323, 342, 354, 498-A and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 34 IPC was deleted later on) at Police Station Barauda, District Sonipat, and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 24.09.2023 (Annexure P-2).

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the present FIR is the result of matrimonial discord. Learned counsel for the petitioner would further contend that now the parties have resolved all their disputes and have entered into a written compromise dated 24.09.2023 and that they are now living together. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment by the Hon’ble Supreme Court rendered 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.

Ms. Mayuri Lakhanpal Kalia, DAG, Haryana. who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State

Mr. J.S. Thakur, Advocate has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and has filed his power of attorney, which is taken on record. He has also reiterated that the parties have resolved all their disputes and are now residing together and that respondent No.2 would have no objection if the aforesaid FIR is quashed in view of the compromise dated 24.09.2023.

List on 24.01.2024.

Meanwhile, the petitioner and respondent No.2 shall appear before the concerned CJM/Illaq Magistrate/Trial Court on 28.11.2023, or on any other date convenient to the Court, for recording of their statements. The CJM/Illaq Magistrate/Trial Court is directed to record 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 24.09.2023 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 30.11.2023 from ld. Sub

Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Gohana has been received, which is taken on

record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1. As per the statement of parties, I believe that compromise has been arrived between the parties voluntarily and without any coercion, pressure of any kind or undue influence. The compromise effected between the parties seems to be genuine and outcome of free consent of the parties.

2. As per the statement of I.O. ASI Sandeep, no other criminal case is pending against accused Jagdeep Singh.

3. As per the statement of I.O. ASI Sandeep, no proclamation proceedings are pending against either of the parties.”

4. Learned counsel for respondent 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 petitioner are 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 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, 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 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) Putting a quietus to the proceedings will bring peace and tranquility amongst parties & will accordingly further the cause of substantial justice.*
- (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.351 dated 09.09.2021 registered under Sections 323, 342, 354, 498-A and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (Section 34 IPC deleted later on) at Police Station Barauda, District Sonipat and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 24.09.2023 (Annexure P-2), is, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

25.01.2024

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Jasmine Kaur

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No