

279

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No. 55274 of 2023

Date of decision : 14.02.2024

Vicky and another

Versus

....Petitioners

State of Punjab and another

.....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. R.G.Chandiwala, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jasjit Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Ms. Khushdeep Mann, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

1 By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of Rapat No.50 dated 12.05.2017 (Annexure P-1) in FIR No.87 dated 28.04.2017 (Annexure P-2) registered under Sections 325 and 34 of IPC, at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

2 On 06.11.2023, the following order was passed:

“The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C by the petitioners seeking quashing of rapat No.50 dated 12.05.2017 in FIR No.87 dated 28.04.2017, registered for offences punishable under Sections 325/34 IPC, at Police Station P.S.Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib.

Learned counsel for the petitioners contend that the matter already stands compromised vide compromise vide Annexure P-3.

Notice of motion for 14.02.2024.

On the asking of the Court, Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab accepts notice on behalf

of respondent No.1-State. Ms. Khushdeep Mann, Advocate and Mr. Gurivinder Pannu, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2 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 Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate on 28.11.2023. On their doing so, the learned Duty Magistrate/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.*
- 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 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 Duty Magistrate/Illaqa Magistrate 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 dated 11.01.2024 from Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Malout has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“From the aforesaid statements of the concerned parties, it appears that :-

*(1) Three persons namely (1) Vicky son of Leelu Ram resident of Village Deon Khra PS Lambi District Sri Muktsar Sahib and (2) Kamaldeep Singh son of Amarjeet Singh @ Babbi r/o village Deon Khra PS Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib i.e. Petitioners no.1 & 2 in CRM-M-55274 of 2023 and (3) **accused Lachhman Singh son of Natha Singh r/o village Deon Khra** were arrayed as accused in this DDR.*

(2) None of the accused was declared proclaimed offender.

*(3) The parties to petition before Hon'ble High Court bearing CRM-M-55274-2023 titled as "Vicky and anr. vs State of Punjab & anr.", **accused / petitioners** namely (1) Vicky son of Leelu Ram resident of Village Deon Khra PS Lambi District Sri Muktsar Sahib and (2) Kamaldeep Singh son of Amarjeet Singh @ Babbi r/o village Deon Khra PS Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib i.e.*

Petitioners no.1 & 2 in CRM-M-55274 of 2023 and Complainant / victim /respondent No.2 namely Bhajan Lal @ Vicky son of Charan Dass r/o village Deon Khera PS Lambi, District Sri Mukrsar Sahib (Respondent No. 2 in CRM-M-55274 of 2023) have voluntarily, without any pressure or coercion or undue influence, and out of their free will and consent have entered into the compromise between themselves and have settled the matter amicably and the said compromise seems to be voluntary, genuine and true. There was another accused namely Lachhman Singh son of Natha Singh r/o village Deon Khera in this case, but no compromise has taken place with him.

(4) The accused are not involved in any other case.

(5) There is only one complainant/victim namely Bhajan Lal @ Vicky son of Charan Dass r/o village Deon Khera PS Lambi, District Sri Mukrsar Sahib (Respondent No. 2 in CRM-M-55274 of 2023) in the present case/DDR.”

4 The aforesaid report reveals that there are total three accused persons and two accused persons are before this Court seeking quashing on the basis of compromise.

5 Learned counsel for respondents No.2 admits the fact of parties having compromised and states that she has no objection in case the FIR and all proceedings subsequent thereto against the two petitioners is quashed.

6 Similarly, learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise (Annexure P-3).

7 I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

8 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 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 wide and 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.*

9 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.*

10 Since the parties are *ad idem* that the compromise/settlement has to be read strictly *inter se* between the parties to the present petition and the complainant wants to pursue prosecution of rest of accused, and it is only accused-petitioners who have approached this Court by way of present petition, the present petition is being entertained and allowed *qua* them only.

11 The question raised by State counsel as to whether the FIR can be quashed in part or not already stands answered by Apex Court in '**Lovely Salhotra and another vs. State (NCT of Delhi)**' reported as (2018) 12 SCC 391, wherein it was observed as under:-

“xx xx xx

We have taken into account the facts of the matter in question as it appears to us that no cognizable offence is made out against the appellants – herein. The High Court was wrong in holding that the F.I.R. cannot be quashed in part and it ought to have appreciated the fact that the appellants - herein cannot be allowed to suffer on the basis of the complaint filed by Respondent No.2 – herein only on the ground that the investigation against

co-accused is still pending. It is pertinent to note that the learned Magistrate has opined that no offence is made out against co-accused Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 6 prima facie.”

12. Consequently, the petition is allowed. Rapat No.50 dated 12.05.2017 (Annexure P-1) in FIR No.87 dated 28.04.2017 (Annexure P-2) registered under Sections 325 and 34 of IPC, at Police Station Lambi, District Sri Muktsar Sahib and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, partially quashed *qua* the petitioners.

14.02.2024
neeraj

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes/No
Whether reportable : Yes/No