

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

286

CRM-M NO.60916 of 2023
DATE OF DECISION: 18.03.2024

Aman Sood

.....Petitioner

VERSUS

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondents

CORAM HON’BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present Mr.Nikhil Mittal, Advocate, for the petitioner.

 Ms. Ankita Ahuja, AAG, Haryana.

 Ms. Veena Hooda, Advocate, for respondent no.2.

SUMEET GOEL, J (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.61 dated 22.06.2017, under Sections 341, 354-A, 506 and 120-B IPC (Section 354-D IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station Naggal and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 25.10.2023 (Annexure P-2) which is stated to have been effected between the parties.
2. On 04.12.2023, the following order was passed:

“This is a petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 for quashing of FIR No.61 dated 22.06.2017 registered at Police Station Naggal under Sections 341, 354-A, 506, 120-B and Section 354-D (added later on) of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, along with all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise dated 25.10.2023 (Annexure P-2) arrived at between the parties.

Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the present is a case of version and cross-version and that the FIR was

a result of misunderstanding and that vide compromise (Annexure P-2) all the disputes stand resolved. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon the judgment by the Hon'ble Supreme Court rendered in "Gian Singh Vs. 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.

On the asking of the Court, Ms. Mahima Yashpal, DAG Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Ms. Veena Hooda, Advocate accepts notice for complainant-respondent No.2. Copy of the petition has already been supplied to both the counsel.

Learned counsel appearing for respondent No.2 has stated that the parties have since entered into a compromise,, which is duly signed by the complainant/respondent No.2. He further submits that the parties have no grudge against each other and further that respondent No.2 has no objection if the aforesaid FIR is quashed in view of the compromise.

List on 18.03.2024.

Meanwhile, the parties are directed to appear before the concerned Chief Judicial Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court on 16.01.2024, or on any other date convenient to the Court, for recording of their statements. The CJM/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court is directed to record the 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 25.10.2023 (Annexure P-2) 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.*
- 4) Whether all the accused are party to the compromise."*

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 13.03.2024 from Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ambala has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“In this regard, detail, as directed, is humbly submitted as under:

1.The settlement/compromise has been freely entered into between the parties without any undue influence, coercion or pressure of any kind.

2.No other criminal cases are pending against the parties.

3.No proclamation proceedings are pending against either of the parties.

4) As per statement of Investigating Officer, there is only one accused namely Aman Sood, who is involved in present case, and who is party to the compromise in question.

In view of statements of parties, it appears that the parties have compromised the matter in dispute voluntarily, without any coercion or undue influence or pressure from any corner, and the compromise is genuine.”

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 petitioner 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 the Hon’ble 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 the Hon’ble 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. Learned counsel for the parties, in support of their contentions have relied upon the following judgments :-

i)Ranjeet Kumar versus State of H.P. & Ors. in case Cr.MMO No. 648 of 2023 decided on 08.12.2023 by the High Court of Himachal Pradesh, Shimla.

- ii) *Arif Khan versus The State and another in case W.P. (CRL) 1064/2023 decided on 09.01.2024 by the High Court of Delhi at New Delhi.*
- iii) *Sukhchain Singh and others versus State of Punjab and others 2021(4) R.C.R. (Criminal) 81.*
- iv) *Ananda DV Vs. State and another 2021 SCC Online SC 3423.*

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) *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) *As per the report received the compromise is said to be voluntary in its nature.*
- (iv) *Complainant/victim is reported to have entered into compromise on his own volition.*

10. Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.61 dated 22.06.2017, under Sections 341, 354-A, 506 and 120-B IPC (Section 354-D IPC added lateron), registered at Police Station Naggal and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise dated 25.10.2023 (Annexure P-2), are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.

18.03.2024

mamta

Whether speaking/reasoned

Whether reportable

Yes/No

Yes/No

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE