

[286] IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-64982-2023 (O&M)
Date of Decision : 15.04.2024

Tajinder Singh ...Petitioner
versus
State of Punjab and anotherRespondents

Coram : **HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN**

Present: Mr. Manuj Nagrath, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Jaswinder Singh Arora, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Abhishek Chaudhry, Advocate for
Mr. Madan Gupta, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

1. By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of FIR No.98 dated 30.04.2019, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 177 IPC, 1860 and Section 12 of the Passport Act, 1967 (Sections 177 and Section 12 of the Passport Act was deleted later on) at Police Station Division No.6, District Ludhiana and Judgment passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Ludhiana, dated 19.12.2019 (Annexure P-2) on the basis of compromise dated 11.08.2023 (Annexure P-3).

2. On 22.12.2023, 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.98 dated 30.04.2019, registered for offences punishable under Section 420, 177 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 12 of Passport Act, 1967 (Sections 177

and 12 Passport Act were deleted later on) at Police Station Division No.6, District Ludhiana and all subsequent proceedings arising thereto on the basis of compromise.

Ld. Counsel for the petitioners contends that the matter already stands compromised vide Annexure P-3.

Notice of motion for 15.04.2024.

Mr. Gaurav Bansal, DAG, Haryana appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Madan Gupta, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondents No.2 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 Trial Court/Duty Magistrate 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 23.02.2024 from the learned Judicial Magistrate Ist Class, Ludhiana, has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“ XX XX XX

On the basis of statements made by the parties appearing before me in both the cross cases, the compromise on the face of it appears to be genuine one having been arrived between the parties with modeep Kar Michelh free will without any pressure or coercion. There is nothing on the record to doubt the genuineness of the compromise so arrived at between the parties.

XX XX XX ”

4. Mr. Abhishek Chaudhry, Advocate for Mr. Madan Gupta, Advocate appears for respondent No.2 and 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. Learned State counsel has stated no objection in case the FIR is quashed based upon the compromise (Annexure P-3).

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 Cr.P.C. to quash proceedings 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) and Mohammad Wajid & Anr. Vs. State of U.P. & Ors., 2023 AIR (SC) 3784.** 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 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.

(h) When it comes to quashing of FIR or criminal proceedings, the criminal antecedents of the accused cannot be the sole consideration to decline to quash the criminal proceedings.

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.98 dated 30.04.2019, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 177 IPC, 1860 and Section 12 of the Passport Act, 1967 (Sections 177 and Section 12 of the Passport Act was deleted later on) at Police Station Division No.6, District Ludhiana and Judgment passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Ludhiana, dated 19.12.2019 (Annexure P-2) and all proceedings arising therefrom, *are, hereby, quashed qua the petitioner.*

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

15.04.2024
'R. Sharma'

Whether speaking/ reasoned	:	Yes/No
Whether reportable	:	Yes/No