



121

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-40348-2024(O&M)

Date of decision : 09.01.2025

Pyare Lal alias Gurpreet Singh alias Pinder Sodi

... Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

...Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. N.S. Sidhu, Advocate for the petitioner.
Mr. Kunwarbir Singh, Asstt.A.G., Punjab.
Mr. Balraj Singh, Advocate for
Mr. Ajay Singh, Advocate for respondent No. 2.

MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed for quashing of FIR No.46 dated 08.07.2015 registered under Sections 120B, 420, 406 of Indian Penal Code, 1860, (for short 'IPC'), at Police Station Sadar Rampura, District Bathinda alongwith all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom on basis of compromise/affidavit dated 01.08.2024 (P-2) arrived at between the parties i.e. petitioner and respondent No. 2.

2. Allegations are that petitioner alongwith co-accused committed fraud on the pretext of providing job to complainant-Sandeep Singh in State Bank of India and usurped an amount of Rs.11.50 lakh from the complainant.

3. The Coordinate Bench, while issuing notice of motion on 22.08.2024, passed the following order:-

“ 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 for 03.02.2025.

At this stage, Mr. Ajay Singh, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No.2 and has filed power of attorney, which is taken on record.

The parties are directed to move an application before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate concerned for getting their statements recorded qua the factum of compromise. As and when any such application is moved and put up before the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall consider the said application and do the needful for recording the statements of the parties qua the factum of the compromise, on any convenient date. After recording the statements of all the affected parties, and upon getting requisite information from Investigating Officer, the trial Court/Illaq Magistrate shall submit its report on the basis of the statements so recorded, broadly on the following aspects:

(i) Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioner, 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?

(iv) 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 report be submitted before this Court on or before the next date.”

4. In terms of aforesaid order, statements of both the parties were recorded and a report dated 18.10.2024 has been submitted in this regard by learned Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Phul. The operative part of the same reads as under:-



“ It is most respectfully submitted that as per the statements of petitioner/accused namely Pyare Lal @ Gurpreet Singh @ Pinder Sodi son of Ratan Lal resident of House No. 15, resident of village Bhaiman Khurd, District Ludhiana and complainant/respondent No.2 Sandeep Singh son of Dilbag Singh resident of Village Jandwala Charat Singh, District Sri Muktsar Sahib, the undersigned is satisfied that the compromise effected between them seems to be genuine, voluntarily, which is not the result of coercion, pressure or undue influence.”

A perusal of the aforesaid report clearly reveals that the matter has been compromised by both the parties with their free consent, voluntarily and without any coercion or undue influence. Even before this Court also, there is no objection by either of the parties against the compromise.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner contends that matter has been amicably settled between the parties i.e. petitioner and respondent No. 2. Also contends that petitioner was earlier declared proclaimed offender in the present FIR and, thereafter, was granted regular bail by learned trial Court on 28.05.2024. Further contends that he is ready to suffer costs of Rs.50,000/- to realize his mistake for not joining the proceedings at relevant point of time.

6. Learned State Counsel, after obtaining instructions has raised no objection to the prayer made by petitioner and acknowledged the factum of compromise.

7. Learned counsel for respondent No. 2 has acknowledged the factum of compromise effected between the parties i.e. petitioner and respondent No. 2.

8. Hon'ble the Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303**, has held 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 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 FIR may be exercised where the offender and the 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 a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the 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 predominatingly 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 the 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 compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate



that the 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.”

9. In view of above, this Court is fully convinced that the offence is entirely personal in nature and does not involve public funds. Thus, quashing of the FIR in question along with consequential proceedings, on the basis of compromise would bring peace and harmony to secure the ends of justice.

10. Consequently, present petition is allowed; aforesaid FIR along with all consequential proceedings resulting therefrom are quashed *qua* petitioner. However, as a deterrence for the future, petitioner shall bear costs of Rs. 50,000/-. Costs be deposited with Punjab and Haryana High Court Employees Welfare Association, Account No. 37167209613, IFSC Code: SBIN0050306, State Bank of India, High Court Branch, Chandigarh within three months from today.

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

09.01.2025
Harish Kumar

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

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