

291 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M No.33044 of 2023 (O&M)

Date of decision : 14.11.2023

Narinder Kumar

...Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab and another

....Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PANKAJ JAIN

Present : Mr. Saurav Bhatia, Advocate
for the petitioner.

Mr. Kunal Vinayak, AAG, Punjab.

Mr. Nitin Gujjar, Advocate for
Mr. Sanpreet Singh, Advocate
for respondent No.2.

PANKAJ JAIN, J. (ORAL)

1 By way of present petition, the petitioner is seeking quashing of
FIR No.74, dated 11.06.2019, registered for offences punishable under
Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, at
Police Station Mataur, District SAS Nagar on the basis of compromise.

2 On 12.07.2023, 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.74, dated 11.06.2019, registered for offences
punishable under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC and Section 24 of
the Immigration Act, at Police Station Mataur, District SAS Nagar
(Anneuxre P-1) and all subsequent proceedings arising thereto on
the basis of compromise.*

Ld. Counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter already stands compromised vide Annexure P-2.

Notice of motion for 28.09.2023.

Mr. Tarun Aggarwal, Sr. DAG, Punjab appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1-State.

Mr. Sanpreet Singh, Advocate appears and accepts notice on behalf of respondent 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 09.08.2023. 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 17.08.2023 from Addl. Chief Judicial Magistrate, SAS Nagar, Mohali has been received, which is taken on record. As per the report, the Trial Court has recorded as follows:-

“1. From the statement of ASI Jagpal Singh, who is Investigating Officer, it seems that only one accused namely Narinder Kumar is arrayed as accused in the present FIR.

2. Further as per the statement of complainant Rupesh Trikha and ASI/Investigating Officer Jagpal Singh no accused has been declared as Proclaimed Offender in the present case.

3. Further from the statements of the parties, the compromise seems to be the result of free Will of the parties and the same is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or under influence.

4. Further as per statement of ASI/Investigating Officer Jagpal Singh. Narinder Kumar is not involved/nominated in any other case except this present case.

5. Further as per statement of ASI/Investigating Officer Jagpal Singh there is only one victim namely Rupesh Trikha who is also complainant in the present FIR.”

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 compromise (Annexure P-2).

6 I have heard learned Counsel for the parties and have carefully gone through the records of the case.

7 After considering judgment rendered by the Apex Court in ***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)***, 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 not affected 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.*

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).*
- (ii) *The offences 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 has entered into compromise on his own volition.*

9 Consequently, the petition is allowed. FIR No.74, dated 11.06.2019, registered for offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 120-B IPC and Section 24 of the Immigration Act, at Police Station Mataur, District SAS Nagar and all proceedings arising therefrom, are, hereby, quashed *qua* the petitioner.

14.11.2023
Pooja sharma-I

(PANKAJ JAIN)
JUDGE

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