

...Petitioner

...Respondents

“This is a petition under Section 482 Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.782 dated 24.12.2020 registered under Sections 498-A, 323, 406 and

2024:PHHC:002912

506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station City Sirsa, District Sirsa, and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the said FIR, on the basis of compromise dated 30.09.2023 (Annexure P-2).

*Learned counsel for the petitioners would contend that the present FIR is the result of a matrimonial discord and now all disputes between the parties stand resolved and they have entered into a written compromise dated 30.09.2023. In compliance of the terms of the settlement, a petition under Section 13-B of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 has also been filed in which statements of the parties on the first motion stand recorded and the case is now fixed for 17.11.2023 for recording of the second motion statements. Learned counsel for the petitioners 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 Lakhnpal Kalia, DAG Haryana, who is present in Court, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Tejas Bansal, 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 since entered into the compromise voluntarily and willingly and that respondent No.2 would have no objection if the aforesaid FIR is quashed in view of the compromise dated 30.09.2023.

List on 10.01.2024.

Meanwhile, the petitioner(s) and respondent No.2 shall

2024:PHHC:002912

appear before the concerned CJM/Illaqa Magistrate/Trial Court on 22.11.2023, or on any other date convenient to the Court, for recording of their statements. The CJM/Illaqa 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 30.09.2023 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 20.12.2023 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Sirsa has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“The compromise arrived between the parties is genuine and voluntarily made, without any undue influence, coercion threat or pressure. Petitioner has not been declared proclaimed offender and no other case is pending against the petitioner.”

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 petitioner is quashed.

5. Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the

2024:PHHC:002912

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, *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,

2024:PHHC:002912

- 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 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.782 dated 24.12.2020 under Sections 498-A, 323, 406 and 506 of IPC, registered at Police Station City Sirsa, District Sirsa and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise deed/agreement dated 30.09.2023 (Annexure P-2), is, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

January 10, 2024

geeta

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether reasoned/speaking:
Whether reportable:

Yes/No
Yes/No