



*Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the parties have since compromised the matter and the compromise dated 24.11.2023 has been appended with the present petition as Annexure P-3. Learned counsel for the petitioner has relied upon 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, Mr. Amish Sharma, learned AAG, Punjab, accepts notice and waives service on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Mr. Rajesh Duhan, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 and 3. Copy of the petition has already been supplied to both the counsel.*

*Learned counsel appearing for respondents No.2 and 3 has stated that the parties have voluntarily entered into a compromise and that the compromise is annexed as Annexure P-3 with the petition. He further states that respondents No.2 and 3 have no objection if the aforesaid FIR is quashed.*

*The Apex Court in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [2012 (10) SCC 303]** has held as under :"*

*"57. 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 F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and 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 serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like 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 predominately civil flavour stand on 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, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put 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 wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above*

*question(s) is in affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”*

*In view of the above cited judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court, this Court considers that it would be unfair and contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding despite compromise between the parties.*

*List on 25.04.2024.*

*Meanwhile, the parties are directed to appear before the concerned CJM/Illaq Magistrate/Trial Court on 08.04.2024, 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 24.11.2023 (Annexure P-3) 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.”*

3. In compliance of the above order, a report has been received from the concerned jurisdictional Court that the compromise between the parties is genuine and arrived at without any pressure or coercion from anyone.

4. In view of the compromise and the ratio of law laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Narinder Singh and others vs. State of Punjab and another, (2014) 6 SCC 466, Ramgopal and another Vs. State of Madhya Pradesh 2021 SCC OnLine SC 834*** and ***Shakuntala Sawhney (Mrs) Vs. Kaushalya (Mrs.) and others (1980) 1 SCC 63*** and Full Bench of this Court in ***Kulwinder Singh Vs. State of Punjab 2007 (3) RCR (Crl.) 1052***, this petition is allowed and FIR No.63 dated 04.04.2023 registered under Sections 376 and 506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, at Police Station Talwindi Sabo, District

Bathinda (Annexure P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed, qua the petitioner.

April 25, 2024  
*manisha*

(HARPREET SINGH BRAR)  
JUDGE

- |      |                           |        |
|------|---------------------------|--------|
| (i)  | Whether speaking/reasoned | Yes/No |
| (ii) | Whether reportable        | Yes/No |