

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

287

CRM-M-59881-2023
Date of decision : 30.01.2024

Parshotam Lal @ Parshotam Ram @ Sonu

....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Ashish Nagar, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunal Vinayak, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Vibha, Advocate and
Mr. Lovejeet Poonia, Advocate for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.172, dated 02.07.2009 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 324, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Banga, District SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) on the basis of compromise (Annexure P-4).

2. On 08.12.2023, the following order was passed :-

“CRM-51012-2023

By way of instant application, the applicant/petitioner is seeking preponement of the date of hearing in the main case.

Heard.

Though no reason is made out for preponing the case as the same was adjourned as the counsel

opted not to appear on the date fixed yet in the interest of justice keeping in view that the party(s) are stated to be settled out of country and scheduled to return abroad on 15.12.2023, the instant application is being entertained. Matter is preponed to today subject to payment of costs of Rs.25000/- to be made good in 7 days and to be deposited with the Punjab and Haryana High Court Bar Association Lawyer's Family Welfare Fund.

For the reasons recorded in the application, the same is allowed. Main case is preponed from 14th of February, 2023 to today itself and accordingly taken on board.

CRM-M-59881-2023

The present petition has been moved invoking jurisdiction of this Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No.172 dated 02.07.2009, registered for offences punishable under Sections 324, 148, 149 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station Banga, District SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) and all subsequent proceedings arising thereto on the basis of compromise.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter already stands compromised vide Annexure P-5.

Notice of motion for 30.01.2024.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

Ms. Vibha, 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 Trial Court/Duty Magistrate on 12.12.2023. On their doing so, the learned Trial Court/Duty Magistrate 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 Trial 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 Trial Court/Duty Magistrate 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 from JMIC, Shaheed Bhagat Singh Nagar dated 11.01.2024 has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“xx xx xx

1. That there are five accused namely Tarsem Lal, Bikramjit, Parshotam Lal Parshotam Ram @ Sonu son of Amarjit Singh, Parshotam Lal son of Lekh Raj, Balwinder Singh and Mandeep Singh were arrayed as accused in the present FIR.

2. As per statement of I.O., accused were not declared as proclaimed offender in other case.

3. From the statements of the parties recorded, it appears to this Court that the compromise effected between the complainant Sohan Lal and petitioner/accused Parshotam Lal @ Parshotam Ram @ Sonu son of Amarjit Singh is genuine and without any pressure, coercion and same has done with the free consent of the parties.

4. As per statement of I.O. accused are not involved in any other criminal case.

5. As per statement of I.O. there is only one victim/complainant namely Sohan Lal in the present case.”

4. Counsel appearing 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.

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 Cr.P.C. to quash proceedings recognizing compromise between the 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 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 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 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.172, dated 02.07.2009 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 324, 148 and 149 of IPC at Police Station Banga, District SBS Nagar (Nawanshahr) and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioner.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

30.01.2024
Dinesh

Whether speaking/reasoned : Yes
Whether reportable : No