



123

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

**CRM-M-4917-2024 (O&M)
Date of decision : 07.04.2025**

Deepak Kumar and another ... Petitioners

Versus

State of Haryana and another ... Respondents

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU

Present: Mr. Vrishank Suri, Advocate for the petitioners.
Mr. Ashok Sehrawat, DAG, Haryana.
Mr. Darpan Bansal, Advocate for
Mr. Vishal Jassal, Advocate for the respondent No.2.


MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU, J.

Present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 praying for quashing of FIR No.62 dated 29.11.2022 (P-1), under Sections 420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 (for short IPC), registered at Police Station, Cyber Police Station, Rohtak, along with all subsequent proceedings arising therefrom *qua* the petitioners on the basis of compromise dated 24.01.2024 (P-2), entered into between the parties i.e. petitioners as well as respondent No.2.

2. Allegations are that petitioners cheated *de facto*-complainant-Zile Singh to the tune of Rs. 2,49,150/-, on pretext of installation of mobile tower, but failed to do so.

3. Contends that matter has been amicably settled between the parties, i.e. petitioners as well as respondent No.2; hence FIR in question as well as subsequent proceedings deserve to be quashed.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 has also acknowledged the contention raised on behalf of the petitioners.



5. Still further, learned State Counsel, on instructions from the police officer present, is not averse in case the above FIR along with subsequent proceedings are quashed and set aside on the basis of the compromise entered into between the parties.

6. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the paper-book.

7. A Co-ordinate Bench, while issuing notice of motion on 31.01.2024, passed the following order:-


“ The petitioners have 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 25.07.2024.

At this stage, Mr. Vishal Jassal, Advocate, has put in appearance on behalf of respondent No. 2 and file his vakalatnama, 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 petitioners, 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.”

8. In terms of aforesaid order, statements of both the parties were recorded and a report dated 15.04.2024 has been received from learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, Rohtak. For reference, the operative part of report reads as under:-

“ *(i). Whether there is any other accused other than the petitioners, arrayed in this petition?*
There are two accused namely Deepak Kumar and Ravinder in this case.
(ii). Whether there is any other complainant or affected/aggrieved party other than the respondents, arrayed in the petition?
There is only one complainant or affected/aggrieved person namely Zile Singh in this case.
(iii). Whether any accused has been declared Proclaimed Offender?
No.
(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?
Yes, the compromise arrived at between the parties is found to be a valid compromise and without any coercion or undue influence.”

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



9. 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.”

10. 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.

11. Consequently, present petition is allowed; aforesaid FIR along with all subsequent proceedings resulting therefrom are quashed *qua* the petitioners.

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

07.04.2025
Harish Kumar

(MAHABIR SINGH SINDHU)
JUDGE

Whether speaking/ reasoned : Yes / No

Whether reportable : Yes / No