2024:PHHC:100700

275

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-64184-2023
Date of Decision: 06.08.2024

Rachhpal Singh and another

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present:- Mr. Vikas Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Karunesh Kaushal, A.A.G., Punjab.

Mr. Amandeep Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

***

RAJESH BHARDWAJ.J (Oral)

Instant petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. praying for quashing of FIR No.110 dated 22.05.2022, under Sections 353, 186, 506, & 509 IPC and Section 3 of Medical Service Persons and Medicare Service Institutions (Prevention of Violence and Damage of Property) Act, 2008 added later on, registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran and further along with all other proceedings consequent thereto on the basis of compromise dated 04.10.2023 (Annexure P-2) entered into between the parties.

FIR in question was got registered by complainant-respondent No.2 and the investigation commenced thereon. However, with the intervention of respectables, finally the parties arrived at settlement and they resolved their inter se dispute, which is apparent from Compromise Deed, annexed as

POOJA SHARMA
2024.08.09 11:37
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

Annexure P-2. On the basis of the compromise, petitioners are invoking the inherent power of this Court by praying that continuation of these proceedings would be a futile exercise and an abuse of process of the Court and thus, the FIR in question and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom may be quashed in the interest of justice.

This Court vide order dated 20.12.2023 directed the parties to appear before the Illaqa/Duty Magistrate for recording their statements, as contended before the Court, and the Illaqa/Duty Magistrate was also directed to send its report.

In pursuance to the same, learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran has sent the report dated 13.03.2024 to this Court. With the report learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran has also annexed the original statement of respondent No.2- Harpuneet Kaur; statements of petitioner No.1, namely, Rachhpal Singh and petitioner No.2, namely, Baljit Kaur, recorded on 28.02.2024 and also statement of ASI Gurbhej Singh recorded on 05.03.2024. On the basis of the statements, learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran has concluded in the report that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. It has been mentioned therein that the petitioners were not declared proclaimed offenders in this case and they have no criminal antecedents.

Learned counsel for the petitioners has relied upon judgment passed in ***CRM-M-31765-2012*** on 01.05.2013 titled as ***'Vinod @ Boda and others Vs. State of Haryana and another' 2017(1) R.C.R.(Criminal) 571,*** whereas it has been held that the High Court can quash criminal proceedings in the peculiar facts and circumstances of the case even where the offence is against public servant.

POOJA SHARMA
2024.08.09 11:37
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the record and the report sent by learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Tarn Taran.

A bare perusal of statutory provision of the 482 Cr.P.C. would show that the High Court may make such orders, as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Section 320 Cr.P.C. is equally relevant for consideration, which prescribes the procedure for compounding of the offences under the Indian Penal Code.

Keeping in view the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, the continuation of criminal prosecution would be a futile exercise. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in a number of cases including ***Narinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466;*** **B.S.Joshi and others** vs **State of Haryana and another (2003) 4 Supreme Court Cases 675** followed by this Court in Full Bench case of **Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR 1052** have dealt with the proposition involved in the present case and settled the law.

Thereafter, Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs State of Punjab and another (2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases 303*** further dealt with the issue and the earlier law settled by the Supreme Court for quashing of the FIR in ***State of Haryana vs Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335***. Para 61 of the judgment reads 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*

POOJA SHARMA
2024.08.09 11:37
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

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 pre-dominatingly 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 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

POOJA SHARMA
2024.08.09 11:37
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

> *compromise between the victim and the 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 the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding."*

Applying the law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in plethora of judgments and this High Court, it is apparent that when the parties have entered into a compromise, then continuation of the proceedings would be merely an abuse of process of the Court and by allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioner by quashing the FIR would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of the legislature enacting under Section 482 Cr.P.C.

In ***'Vinod @ Boda and others Vs. State of Haryana and another (supra)*** the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held as under:-

> "*In the present case, merely because the complainant was working as a teacher and injuries were caused to him while he was on duty at School, learned Single Judge has treated it to be a case of an offence against the `society' observing that public servant has been prohibited from performing his duties, the proceedings cannot be quashed. Whereas, in the facts and circumstances of the case, the dispute was prima facie between the parties in their individual and private capacity. Therefore, even on merit, the present is a fit case where the ends of justice demand quashing of proceedings as the dispute has been settled amicably and this would bring harmony between the parties."*

As a result, this Court finds that the case in hand squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents and hence, FIR No.110 dated 22.05.2022, under Sections 353, 186, 506, & 509 IPC and Section 3 of Medical Service Persons and Medicare Service Institutions (Prevention of Violence and Damage of Property) Act, 2008 added later on,

POOJA SHARMA
2024.08.09 11:37
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document

registered at Police Station City Tarn Taran along with subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* petitioners on the basis of compromise. Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

Petition stands allowed.

06.08.2024 **(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)**
ps-I **JUDGE**

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

POOJA SHARMA
2024.08.09 11:37
I attest to the accuracy and
integrity of this document