



306 (1st case)

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

**CRM-M-61716-2023 (O&M)
Date of decision: 14.05.2024**

Rashi Jain

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Sachin Jain, Advocate for the petitioner.

Ms. Avneet, AAG, Punjab for respondent No.1.

Mr. Davinder Kumar, Advocate for respondent No.2.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.118 dated 19.12.2016 (P-1), under Sections 279, 337 & 427 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, registered at Police Station Punjab Agriculture University (PAU), District Police Commissionerate, District Ludhiana along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom qua the petitioner on the basis of compromise by way of affidavit dated 11.08.2023 (P-5).



- (2) Facts of the case are that two Cars coming from opposite side collided with each other, which resulted into multiple injuries to both sides.
- (3) This Court, while issuing notice of motion on 20.12.2023, passed the following order:-

“Learned counsel for the petitioner contends, inter alia, that matter has been compromised between the parties i.e. petitioner and respondent No.2.

(2) Notice of motion.

(3) Mr. Joginder Pal Ratra, Senior DAG, Punjab, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

(4) Mr. Davinder Kumar, Advocate, causes representation on behalf of respondent No.2 and acknowledged the factum of compromise between the parties.

(5) Requisite number of copies of the petition be supplied to learned Counsel for the respondents during the course of day.

(6) Petitioner shall file his affidavit that there is no other criminal case(s) pending against him and also give the details of any other FIR(s), already quashed on the basis of compromise.

(7) In view of the above, let parties appear before the Court of learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court on or before 10.01.2024 for recording their statement(s) with reference to the compromise, if any, entered into between them.

(8) Learned Illaqa Magistrate/trial Court shall record the statement(s) of all accused, complainant/injured and victim, if any, and submit a report to this Court before the next date of hearing containing the following information:-

- (i) Whether the statements of the parties are bona fide and not result of any pressure or coercion etc. in any manner?*



(ii) Whether the compromise effected between the parties is genuine and valid?

(iii) Whether all the accused, complainant and injured are party to the compromise and if not, the details/particulars of such person(s)?

(iv) Whether any other case is pending against either of the parties or not, if yes, the details thereof?

(v) Whether any of the persons involved in this case/dispute has been declared a proclaimed offender?

(vi) Whether any of the petitioner(s) is/are previous convict or not?

(9) List before this Court on 21.03.2024 for further consideration.

(10) Meanwhile, learned State Counsel shall also get the instructions in the matter as to whether the State has any objection?

(11) Copy of this order be sent to learned Judicial Officer concerned forthwith for information and strict compliance.”

(4) In terms of aforesaid order, the statements of both the parties were recorded by learned Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Ludhiana and submitted a report dated 18.03.2024. The operative part of the same reads as under:-

“On the basis of the statements of the parties recorded above, point wise report of this Court is submitted hereinafter:

1. The statements of the parties are bonafide and not result of any pressure or coercion etc. in any manner.

2. From the statements of the parties and from their demeanor during preliminary questioning, the compromise between the parties appears to be genuine and valid.



3. All the parties i.e. the accused and the complainant/injured are party to the compromise

4. It is pertinent to mention here that a cross version case in FIR no. 118/16 titled as "State Vs. Rachna Singh Jainer" is pending before this Court in which the present accused Rashi Jain is the complainant and Rachna Singh Jainer who is not the complainant in the present case is the sole accused.

5. None of the persons involved in this case/dispute has been declared proclaimed offender.

6. The petitioner/accused is not the previous convict. ”

(5) A perusal of the aforesaid report clearly reveals that matter has been compromised by both sides i.e. petitioner as well as respondent No.2 with their free consent, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. Even before this Court also, there is no grievance shown by either of the parties against each other.

(6) Learned State Counsel, on instructions from ASI Dimple, also submitted that they have no objection in case the aforesaid FIR as well as consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis of the compromise effected between the parties.

(7) Learned Counsel for respondent No.2 also raises no objection.

(8) Hon'ble the Supreme Court in '**Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab**', (2012) 10 SCC 303, has held as under:-

“61. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus : the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline



engrafted in such power viz. : (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to



secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

- (9) In view of above, this Court is fully convinced that the offence is entirely personal in nature and does not affect any public peace or tranquility. Thus, quashing of the FIR in question along with consequential proceedings on the basis of compromise would bring peace and harmony to secure the ends of justice.
- (10) Consequently, present petition is allowed; aforesaid FIR along with all consequential proceedings resulting therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner.
- (11) Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

14th May, 2024
Gagan

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes/No
Whether Reportable	Yes/No