

287

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-63777-2023

Date of Decision : April 03, 2024

Naveen and others

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State of Haryana and another

.....Respondent(s)

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present:- Mr. Rahul Makkar, Advocate
for the petitioner(s).

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, AAG, Haryana.

Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate for
Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate
for respondent Nos.2 and 3.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (Oral)

1 By way of present petition, petitioners are seeking quashing of FIR No.184 dated 19.09.2023 registered under Sections 285, 323, 506, 34 of IPC, 1860 and 30 of Arms Act at Police Station Sadar, Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar and all consequent proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of compromise.

2 On 19.12.2023, the following order was passed:

“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.184 dated 19.09.2023, registered for offences punishable under Sections 285, 323, 506, 34 of IPC at Police Station Sadar Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar 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-2. Notice of motion for 03.04.2024.

On asking of the Court, Mr. Ashok Kumar Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.-1 State. Mr. Vikas Kumar, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos.2 and 3 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 15.02.2024. 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 Duty Magistrate/Illaq Magistrate/trial Court 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 dated 08.02.2024 from Civil Judge (Jr. Divn.)-cum-Judicial Magistrate 1st Class, Bahadurgarh has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“I have the honour to submit that in compliance of order dated

19.12.2023 passed in CRM-M-63777-2023 in case titled as “Naveen Vs. State of Haryana and anr.”, complainant, victim along-with accused persons appeared and made their separate statements to the effect that the matter has been compromised and they have settled their dispute without any pressure. Complainant alongwith victim submitted that they want to get cancelled the FIR bearing No.184 dated 19.09.2023, P.S. Sadar, Bahadurgarh, under Sections 323, 285, 506, 34 of IPC and Section 30 of Arms Aact.

Copy of statements made by complainant, victim as well as the statement of accused persons as well as statement of Investigating Officer and the zimni order dated 23.01.2024 is attached herewith for your kind perusal.

Further, detailed reply is hereunder as directed:-

- 1. As per the statement of Investigating Officer, there are three accused persons namely Krishna Devi, Laxman and Naveen are involved in the present case.*
- 2. As per the statement of Investigating Officer, no accused have been declared proclaimed offender.*
- 3. In my opinion, the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence.*
- 4. As per the statement of Investigating Officer, accused Laxman and Krishna Devi are not involved in any other case. However, as per record one FIR No.307 of 2020 PS Sadar, Bahadurgarh was got registered against accused Naveen.*
- 5. As per the statement of Investigating Officer, there are two victims namely Parmod (complainant) and Subhash Chander in the in the present FIR.”*

4 Learned counsel for respondent Nos.2 and 3 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 recognizing compromise between 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 wiser 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.184 dated 19.09.2023 registered under Sections 285, 323, 506, 34 of IPC, 1860 and 30 of Arms Act at Police Station Sadar, Bahadurgarh, District Jhajjar and all proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners.

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

03.04.2024
spn

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes
Whether Reportable :	No

