



CRM-M-53167-2024

1

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Sr. No.301

Case No. : CRM-M-53167-2024

Decided On : January 22, 2025

Parvinder Singh and another Petitioners

vs.

State of Punjab and another Respondents

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY VASHISTH.

* * *

Present : Mr. Bhupinder Kumar Gupta, Advocate
for the petitioners.

Mr. Jasdeep Singh, DAG, Punjab.

Mr. Gurmehar Singh Minhas, Advocate
for Mr. Aabhas Prabhakar, Advocate
for respondent no.2.

* * *

SANJAY VASHISTH, J. (Oral) :

1. The present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, has been filed by the petitioner, for quashing of FIR No.72, dated 17.09.2021 (Annexure P-1), for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, 1860, registered at Police Station Narot Jaimal Singh, District Pathankot and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise dated 21.03.2024 (Annexure P-2).

2. Vide orders dated 24.10.2024 and 05.12.2024, the affected parties were directed to appear before the learned trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate, for getting their respective statements recorded with regard to



the compromise. The trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate was to submit a report in this regard giving certain details as enumerated in the said orders.

3. Pursuant to the orders dated 24.10.2024 and 05.12.2024, passed by this Court, the parties have appeared before learned Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Pathankot and as per report dated 16.12.2024, submitted to this Court, both the parties have got recorded their respective statements in Court. Said report received from learned Court below reads as under:-

“With reference to the subject cited above, it is submitted that vide order dated 24.10.2024 and 05.12.2024, passed by Hon'ble Punjab and Haryana High Court, Chandigarh in the aforesaid case, the report of this Court was called on or before the next date of hearing as to the genuineness of compromise, the stage of trial/proceedings, the number of accused arrayed in the FIR and also whether any PO Proceedings are pending against any of the accused persons. Further, number of victims and their names.

In compliance of the above said order, the parties to the petition appeared before Illaqa Magistrate on 12.12.2024. Statement of Complainant namely Dhian Chand son of Kali Dass, resident of Village Gher, PS Narot Jaimal Singh, Pathankot and accused persons namely Parvinder Singh son of Gurnam Singh, resident of Village Bhedpura, Post Office Barsat, Tehsil and District Patiala and Kuldeep Singh son of Gobind Singh, resident of Village Paharpur, PS Pasiana, District Patiala have been recorded.

In compliance of the above said order, complainant Dhian Chand son of Kali Dass, resident of Village Gher, PS Narot Jaimal Singh, Pathankot and accused persons namely Parvinder Singh son of Gurnam Singh, resident of Village Bhedpura, Post Office Barsat, Tehsil and District Patiala and Kuldeep Singh son of Gobind Singh, resident of Village

**CRM-M-53167-2024****3**

Paharpur, PS Pasiana, District Patiala appeared before the undersigned on 12.12.2024.

After going through the statements made by complainant and accused persons this Court is of the opinion that the parties have settled their matter voluntary, without any pressure, coercion or undue influence from any quarter. The said compromise is genuine, without any pressure or undue influence.

Statement of Investigating Officer SI Hardeep Singh Number 1239/GSP, Police Station Narot Jaimal Singh, Pathankot was also recorded to this effect. It is further submitted that Dhian Chand son of Kali Dass, resident of Village Gher, PS Narot Jaimal Singh, Pathankot was arrayed as victim who is complainant in the present case FIR. Accused persons mentioned above were never declared as proclaimed person/offender in the present case FIR and PO proceedings were never initiated against the accused persons. It is further submitted that case is pending for prosecution evidence but on the last date of hearing i.e. on 06.11.2024 none of the accused persons appeared and notice was issued to them. There are two accused persons namely Parvinder Singh son of Gurnam Singh, resident of Village Bhedpura, Post Office Barsat, Tehsil and District Patiala and Kuldeep Singh son of Gobind Singh, resident of Village Paharpur, PS Pasiana, District Patiala. There is only one victim Dhian Chand son of Kali Dass, resident of Village Gher, PS Narot Jaimal Singh, Pathankot.

It is pertinent to mention here that the cost of Rs. 5000/- imposed upon the petitioners/accused persons which is to be deposited in DLSA, Pathankot has been deposited. Receipt of the same has also been placed on record.

Photocopies of their statements and their respective Aadhar Cards of complainant, accused persons and Investigating Officer are attached with this report. This is for



CRM-M-53167-2024

4

your kind information and necessary action please.

Hence, the report is submitted.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners urged that due to intervention of the respectable respectable persons of the area, the matter has been resolved and private parties have effected a compromise dated 21.03.2024 (Annexure P-2). At present, there remains no dispute amongst the private parties. He further submits that in view of the compromise so effected between the private parties, pendency of the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings emanating therefrom would be sheer abuse of the process of law.

5. Learned State counsel as also learned counsel for respondent No.2, after going through the statements and the report received from learned Court below, very fairly admit that the private parties have resolved their dispute and effected a compromise and that they have no objection if the impugned FIR and all the consequential proceedings are quashed on the basis of the compromise.

6. The Full Bench of this Court, in the matter of **Kulwinder Singh and others v. State of Punjab and another** reported as **2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 1052**, has observed as under:

“(28) To conclude, it can safely be said that there can never be any hard and fast category which can be prescribed to enable the Court to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. The only principle that can be laid down is the one which has been incorporated in the Section itself, i.e., "to prevent abuse of the process of any Court" or "to secure the ends of justice”.

*(29) In **Mrs. Shakuntala Sawhney v. Mrs. Kaushalya Sawhney and others**, Hon'ble Krishna Iyer, J. aptly summoned up the essence of compromise in the following words :*



“The finest hour of justice arrives propitiously when parties, despite falling apart, bury the hatchet and weave a sense of fellowship of reunion.”

(30) The power to do complete justice is the very essence of every judicial justice dispensation system. It cannot be diluted by distorted perceptions and is not a slave to anything, except to the caution and circumspection, the standards of which the Court sets before it, in exercise of such plenary and unfettered power inherently vested in it while donning the cloak of compassion to achieve the ends of justice.

(31) No embargo, be in the shape of Section 320(9) of the Cr.P.C., or any other such curtailment, can whittle down the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C.

(32) The compromise, in a modern society, is the sine qua non of harmony and orderly behaviour. It is the soul of justice and if the power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is used to enhance such a compromise which, in turn, enhances the social amity and reduces friction, then it truly is "finest hour of justice". Disputes which have their genesis in a matrimonial discord, landlord-tenant matters, commercial transactions and other such matters can safely be dealt with by the Court by exercising its powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. in the event of a compromise, but this is not to say that the power is limited to such cases. There can never be any such rigid rule to prescribe the exercise of such power, especially in the absence of any premonitions to forecast and predict eventualities which the cause of justice may throw up during the course of a litigation.

(33) The only inevitable conclusion from the above discussion is that there is no statutory bar under the Cr.P.C. which can affect the inherent power of this Court under Section 482. Further, the same cannot be limited to matrimonial cases alone and the Court has the wide power to quash the proceedings even in non-compoundable offences notwithstanding the bar under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C., in order to prevent the abuse of law and to secure the ends of justice.

(34) The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. is to be exercised Ex-Debitia Justitia to prevent an abuse of process of Court. There can neither be an exhaustive list nor the defined para-meters to enable a High Court to invoke or exercise its



inherent powers. It will always depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case. The power under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. has no limits. However, the High Court will exercise it sparingly and with utmost care and caution. The exercise of power has to be with circumspection and restraint. The Court is a vital and an extra-ordinary effective instrument to maintain and control social order. The Courts play role of paramount importance in achieving peace, harmony and ever-lasting congeniality in society. Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a Court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.”

7. The legal principles, as laid down for quashing of the criminal proceedings, were also approved by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another, (2012) 10 SCC 303**. Furthermore, the broad principles for exercising the powers under Section 482 were summarized by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others v. State of Gujarat and another, (2017) 9 SCC 641**.

8. Further, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has held in **Ramgopal and another v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 SCC Online SC 834** that the matters, which can be categorized as personal in nature or in the matter in which the nature of injuries do not exhibit mental depravity or commission of an offence of such a serious nature that quashing of which would override public interest, the Court can quash the FIR in view of the settlement arrived at amongst the parties. The observation of the Hon'ble Supreme Court is extracted as under:-

“19. We thus sum-up and hold that as opposed to Section 320 Cr.P.C. where the Court is squarely guided by the compromise between the parties in respect of offences



‘compoundable’ within the statutory framework, the extraordinary power enjoined upon a High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. or vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution, can be invoked beyond the metes and bounds of Section 320 Cr.P.C. Nonetheless, we reiterate that such powers of wide amplitude ought to be exercised carefully in the context of quashing criminal proceedings, bearing in mind: (i) Nature and effect of the offence on the conscious of the society; (ii) Seriousness of the injury, if any; (iii) Voluntary nature of compromise between the accused and the victim; & (iv) Conduct of the accused persons, prior to and after the occurrence of the purported offence and/or other relevant considerations.”

9. After hearing learned counsel for the parties and going through the material available on record, this Court finds that there appears to be substance in the submission of learned counsel for the petitioners that pendency of the present criminal litigation would be abuse of process of law since the chances of conviction of the petitioners are bleak in view of the compromise so effected between the private parties.

10. The report, alongwith statements of the affected parties received from learned Court below, would reveal that the aggrieved person has genuinely effected a compromise with the petitioners and he has no objection if the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed.

11. Keeping in view totality of the facts and circumstances of the case and taking into consideration the ratio of the judgments in the cases of **Gian Singh (supra)**, **Ramgopal (supra)** and **Kulwinder Singh (supra)**, this petition is accepted and FIR No.72, dated 17.09.2021 (Annexure P-1), for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 120-B IPC, 1860, registered

at Police Station Narot Jaimal Singh, District Pathankot and all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners, in view of compromise dated 21.03.2024 (Annexure P-3).

12. Petition stands disposed of.

January 22, 2025

monika

(SANJAY VASHISTH)
JUDGE

<i>Whether speaking/reasoned ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>
<i>Whether reportable ?</i>	<i>Yes/No.</i>