

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT
CHANDIGARH

284

CRM-M-277-2024

Date of decision: 22.02.2024

Amit Kumar and another

...Petitioners

V/s

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Sukhdev Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Yuvraj Singh, AAG Punjab.
Mr. Sahil Nain, Advocate for respondent No.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.141 dated 20.11.2021 under Sections 406 and 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station, Women, District police Commissionerate Ludhiana, and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise/affidavit dated 05.09.2023 (Annexure 2), which is stated to have been effected between the parties.

2 On 08.01.2024, the following order was passed:

“The petitioners have approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Adhiraj Singh, AAG, Punjab, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No 1 State of Punjab and accepts notice.

Mr. Sahil Nain, Advocate has filed vakalatnama for respondent No. 2. The same be taken on record.

The parties are directed to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise in the following manner:

(i) The petitioners shall appear before the trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate concerned on 29.01.2024 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate for recording statement of the petitioners as well as of the complainant qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such appearance is made, the trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate shall do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise. It shall be open to the trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate to either record the statement of the parties by physical process or by video conferencing as deemed appropriate by the trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate.

(ii) In case the statement is to be recorded by way of video conferencing, the parties concerned shall be duly identified through video conferencing by their respective counsel, subject to the satisfaction of the Presiding Officer. (iii) The trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate may also choose to get the statements of the parties recorded through some Commissioner, appointed by the Court who would be some Advocate having sufficient standing at the Bar. In case the statement is recorded through some Commissioner, such Commissioner/Advocate shall furnish an affidavit after recording statements to the effect that the parties had appeared before him/her and he/she had recorded their statements as per law and that the said parties had been duly identified by their respective counsel. This shall be subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate.

After recording the statements of all the affected parties in either of the aforesaid manner, the trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded as to whether all the affected parties have entered into a compromise and as to whether the compromise in question is found to be a valid compromise and has been effected without there being any kind of influence or coercion.

The trial Court/Ilaqa Magistrate shall also report as regards the following facts after seeking information from Investigating Officer, concerned:

(i) Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioners, arrayed in this petition.

(ii) Whether there is any other complainant or affected/ aggrieved party other than the respondents, arrayed in the petition.

iii) Whether any accused has been declared Proclaimed Offender?

The report be submitted before this Court before the next date of hearing i.e. 22.02.2024”

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 19.02.2024 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1. In compliance of the order dated 08.01.2024 passed in CRM-M- 277-2024 by Hon'ble Punjab & Haryana High Court, I have the honour to submit as under:

2. The undersigned has recorded the separate statement of complainant namely Kamini Kanojia D/o Late. Om Prakash Kanojia who stated in her statement that she is the complainant of the present case and on his statement present case bearing FIR No.141 dated 20.11.2021, u/s 406, 498-A IPC, PS Women, Ludhiana was registered against accused namely Amit Kumar and Rani. Now with the intervention of respectables, she has entered into compromise with the accused without any pressure, coercion and undue influence. She has no objection, if the present FIR be quashed, She has also placed on record copy of her Aadhar card as her identity proof. Thereafter, separate statement of accused Amit Kumar and Rani was recorded who in their statement stated that with the intervention of respectables, they have entered into compromise with the complainant Kamini Kanojia without any pressure, coercion and undue influence and they have no objection if quashing petition is accepted. They have also placed on record the copy of their adhaar cards as their identity proof, Thereafter, undersigned recorded the statement of IO ASI Veena Rani No.2799/Ldh, PS Division No.4, Ludhiana who in her statement stated the she is the IO of the present case and as per record present FIR has been registered against accused Amit Kumar and Rani. Also, Kamini Kanojia is the only complainant in the present case. He further stated that accused have never been declared PO and no other FIR is pending or decided against them.

3. The undersigned has orally asked the accused and complainant about the compromise to which they submitted that the compromise is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. Hence, I am of the considered view that the compromise between the complainant and accused is valid, genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. There are only two accused challaned in the present case namely Amit Kumar and Rani. Accused have never been declared proclaimed offender nor involved in any other criminal

case as per statement of IO. Now matter has been compromised between the parties. Hence, report is hereby sent your goodself for your kind perusal.

4 The true copies of the statements so recorded are annexed herewith for kind reference please.

Submitted Please.”

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 petitioners 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.141 dated 20.11.2021 under Sections 406 and 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station, Women, District police Commissionerate Ludhiana, and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of

CRM-M-277-2024

compromise/affidavit dated 05.09.2023 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby,
quashed qua the petitioners.

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

February 22, 2024
Ajay

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