

128

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-11049-2024 in/and
CRM-M-65165-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision: 18.03.2024

TINKU KUMAR
Vs.
STATE OF PUNJAB AND ANOTHER

.. Applicant-Petitioner

..Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUMEET GOEL

Present: Mr. Kanhiya Soni, Advocate for
Mr. Sunil Bhoria, Advocate for applicant-petitioner.

Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG, Punjab.

Ms. Devpreet Sidhu, Advocate for respondent No.2.

...

SUMEET GOEL, J. (Oral)

CRM-11049-2024

1. Instant application has been filed for restoration of CRM-M-65165-2023 by recalling the order dated 29.02.2024.
2. Notice of the application.
3. On asking of the Court, Mr. Adhiraj Singh Thind, AAG, Punjab, appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State. Ms. Devpreet Sidhu, Advocate accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2.
4. For the reasons stated in the application as also in view of the submissions made by learned counsel for applicant-petitioner, the instant application is allowed. The order dated 29.02.2024 is recalled & the main petition i.e. CRM-M-65165-2023 is restored to its original status and number. List the main case today itself i.e. 18.03.2024.

CRM-M-65165-2023 (O&M)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.28 dated 21.03.2022 under Section 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Handesra, District SAS Nagar and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom qua the petitioner, on the basis of joint petition for mutual divorce (Annexure P-2) filed by the petitioner and respondent No.2 which has been allowed.

2 On 15.01.2024, the following order was passed:

“The petitioner has approached this Court seeking quashing of FIR (Annexure P-1) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a compromise having been effected between the parties.

Notice of motion.

At this stage, Mr. Hemant Aggarwal, AAG, Punjab, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.1-State of Punjab and accepts notice.

Ms. Devpreet Sidhu, Advocate has filed vakalatnama for respondent No. 2. The same be taken on record.

The parties are directed to get their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise in the following manner:

(i) The petitioner shall appear before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned on 23.01.2024 or any date thereafter as fixed by trial Court/Illaq Magistrate for recording statements of the petitioner as well as of the complainant qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such appearance is made, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise. It shall be open to the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate to either record the statements of the parties by physical process or by video conferencing as deemed appropriate by the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.

(ii) In case the statement is to be recorded by way of video conferencing, the parties concerned shall be duly identified through video conferencing by their respective counsel, subject to the satisfaction of the Presiding Officer.

(iii) The trial Court/Illaq Magistrate may also choose to get the statements of the parties recorded through some Commissioner, appointed by the Court who would be some Advocate having

sufficient standing at the Bar. In case the statement is recorded through some Commissioner, such Commissioner/Advocate shall furnish an affidavit after recording statements to the effect that the parties had appeared before him/her and he/she had recorded their statements as per law and that the said parties had been duly identified by their respective counsel. This shall be subject to satisfaction of trial Court/Illaq Magistrate.

After recording the statements of all the affected parties in either of the aforesaid manner, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded as to whether all the affected parties have entered into a compromise and as to whether the compromise in question is found to be a valid compromise and has been effected without there being any kind of influence or coercion.

The trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall also report as regards the following facts after seeking information from Investigating Officer, concerned:

(i) Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioners, arrayed in this petition?

(ii) Whether there is any other complainant or affected/ aggrieved party other than the respondents, arrayed in the petition?

(iii) Whether any accused has been declared Proclaimed Offender?

The report be submitted before this Court before the next date of hearing i.e. 27.02.2024."

3. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, report dated 13.02.2024 from Id. JMIC, Dera Bassi, has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

"I am currently Investigating Officer of this case i.e. FIR no. 28 dated 21.03.2022 under sections 498-A of IPC, PS Handesara. There is only one accused namely Tinku Kumar in the present case. He has not been declared as proclaimed person or proclaimed offender by the court in this case till date. I have been informed that complainant Rita Rani has entered into compromise with accused person. Accused is not involved in any other case. As per record, there is only one complainant in the present FIR,"

From the perusal of the above statements of parties (duly identified by respective counsels) and Investigating Officer, this Court is satisfied that the complainant and accused person i.e. the affected parties, with the intervention of respectables, have compromised the matter with each other voluntarily and with their free consent, without any kind of pressure or coercion."

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 join petition for mutual divorce has been allowed (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 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 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) 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) 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.28 dated 21.03.2022 under Section 498-A of IPC, registered at Police Station Handesra, District SAS Nagar and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed qua the petitioner on the basis of joint petition for mutual divorce (Annexure P-2) filed by the petitioner and respondent No.2, which has been allowed.

10. Pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed off.

18.03.2024
Jasmine Kaur

(SUMEET GOEL)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned	Yes	No
Whether reportable	Yes	No