



**250 IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA
AT CHANDIGARH**

CRM-M-57057-2024

Date of Decision: 07.01.2025

Amit and others

...Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and others

...Respondents

CORAM:- HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH BHARDWAJ

Present:- Mr. Kapish Singla, Advocate for the petitioners.

Mr. Ramesh Kumar Ambavta, A.A.G., Haryana.

Mr. Karanvir Singh, Advocate
for respondents No.2 to 10.

RAJESH BHARDWAJ.J (Oral)

1. Instant petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No.168 dated 09.03.2023, under Sections 201, 323, 325, 506 and 34 of IPC and Section 3 of S.C./S.T. Act, registered at Police Station Kundli, District Sonipat and all other subsequent proceedings arising thereof on the basis of compromise deed dated 04.05.2024 (Annexure P-2).

2. FIR in question was got registered by complainant-respondent No.2 and the investigation commenced thereon. However, with the intervention of respectables, finally the parties arrived at settlement and they resolved their inter se dispute, which is apparent from Compromise Deed, annexed as Annexure P-2. On the basis of the compromise, petitioners are invoking the inherent power of this Court by praying that continuation of these proceedings would be a futile exercise and an abuse of process of the Court and thus, the FIR in question and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom may be quashed in the interest of justice.

3. This Court vide order dated 18.11.2024 directed the parties to appear before the Trial Court/Illaq/Duty Magistrate for recording their statements, as contended before the Court, and the Trial Court/Illaq/Duty



Magistrate was also directed to send its report.

4. In pursuance to the same, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat has sent the report dated 09.12.2024 to this Court. With the report, he has also annexed the photocopy of statement of respondent No.2, namely, Ajay/complainant and joint statement of respondents No.3 to 10, namely, Bir Singh, Ravi @ Ravinder Kumar, Deepak, Chetan, Bijender, Billechand, Vicky and Sandeep; joint statement of petitioners, namely, Amit, Brijpal and Sumit. On the basis of the statements, learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat has concluded in the report that the compromise effected between the parties is genuine, voluntary and without any coercion or undue influence. It has been mentioned that there were total 11 accused in the FIR, however, challan was filed only against the present three accused i.e. the petitioners. It has further been mentioned that as per the report of the Investigating officer, petitioners were not declared as proclaimed offenders in this case and the accused persons are not involved in any other case/FIR.

5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties, perused the record and the report sent by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Sonapat.

6. A bare perusal of statutory provision of the 528 of B.N.S.S. would show that the High Court may make such orders, as may be necessary to give effect to any order under this Code or to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. Section 359 B.N.S.S. is equally relevant for consideration, which prescribes the procedure for compounding of the offences under the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

7. Keeping in view the nature of offences allegedly committed and the fact that both the parties have amicably settled their dispute, the continuation of criminal prosecution would be a futile exercise. The Hon'ble



Supreme Court in a number of cases including ***Narinder Singh and others Versus State of Punjab and another, 2014 (6) SCC 466***; **B.S.Joshi and others vs State of Haryana and another (2003) 4 Supreme Court Cases 675** followed by this Court in Full Bench case of ***Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2007(3) RCR 1052*** have dealt with the proposition involved in the present case and settled the law.

8. Thereafter, Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs State of Punjab and another (2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases 303*** further dealt with the issue and the earlier law settled by the Supreme Court for quashing of the FIR in ***State of Haryana vs Bhajan Lal, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335***. Para 61 of the judgment reads 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 F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and 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 serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like 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 pre-dominatingly 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 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 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. This court notes that the petitioner is also charged under section 3 of the SC/ST Act, which is an offence arising out of a special statute. The mere fact that the offence is covered under a ‘special statute’ would not refrain this Court, from exercising its respective powers under Article 142 of the Constitution or Section 482 Cr.P.C. and proceedings can be quashed on the basis of compromise.

10. Hon'ble Supreme Court in case of **‘Ramawatar v. State of Madhya Pradesh, 2021 AIR (SC) 5228’** has held as under:-

“16.where it appears to the Court that the offence in question,



although covered under the SC/ST Act, is primarily private or civil in nature, or where the alleged offence has not been committed on account of the caste of the victim, or where the continuation of the legal proceedings would be an abuse of the process of law, the Court can exercise its powers to quash the proceedings. On similar lines, when considering a prayer for quashing on the basis of a compromise/settlement, if the Court is satisfied that the underlying objective of the Act would not be contravened or diminished even if the felony in question goes unpunished, the mere fact that the offence is covered under a 'special statute' would not refrain this Court or the High Court, from exercising their respective powers under Article 142 of the Constitution or Section 482 Cr.P.C.”

11. Applying the law settled by Hon'ble Supreme Court in plethora of judgments and this High Court, it is apparent that when the parties have entered into a compromise, then continuation of the proceedings would be merely an abuse of process of the Court and by allowing and accepting the prayer of the petitioners by quashing the FIR would be securing the ends of justice, which is primarily the object of the legislature enacting under Section 528 of B.N.S.S.

12. As a result, this Court finds that the case in hand squarely falls within the ambit and parameters settled by judicial precedents and hence, FIR No.168 dated 09.03.2023, under Sections 201, 323, 325, 506 and 34 of IPC and Section 3 of S.C./S.T. Act, registered at Police Station Kundli, District Sonipat and all other subsequent proceedings arising thereof is hereby quashed qua the petitioners on the basis of compromise. Needless to say that the parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the compromise and their statements recorded before the Court below.

13. Petition stands allowed.

07.01.2025

ps-I

(RAJESH BHARDWAJ)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/reasoned: Yes/No

Whether Reportable: Yes/No