

(2020) 03 SHI CK 0006
In the High Court Of Himachal Pradesh
Case No : Cr. MMO No. 11 Of 2020

Ajmer Singh

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of H.P. & Ors

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 03-03-2020

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 320, 482
Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 307, 406, 498A
Arms Act, 1959 — Section 24, 25, 54, 59
Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 142, 226

Citation : (2020) 03 SHI CK 0006

Hon'ble Judges : Chander Bhusan Barowalia, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : R.K. Gautam, Gaurav Gautam, Shvi Pal Manhans, P.K. Bhatti,
Prashant Chaudhary

Final Decision : Dismissed

Judgement

Chander Bhusan Barowalia, J

1. The present petition is maintained by the petitioner under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter to be called as "the

Code") for quashing of F.I.R No. 400 of 2016, dated 28.12.2016, under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25-54-59 of Arms Act,

registered at Police Station, Nurpur, District Kangra, H.P.

2. Briefly stating the facts, giving rise to the present petition, as per the prosecution story, are that on 28.12.2016, respondent No. 2 was going to

Village Garan alongwith his cousin brother (respondent No.3) in his Car. At about 4:30 p.m, when they reached Khehar near Sainik Academy and

were talking to their friends, the petitioner came there and asked them to remove their vehicle. Upon which, respondents No.2 and 3 responded by

saying that since now they are talking to their friends, they will remove their vehicle after sometime. In the meanwhile, the petitioner opened the door

of a Maruti Car parked there and returned with a baseball bat and started beating to respondent No.2, due to which, he sustained injury on his left arm

and shoulder. When respondent No.3 stepped out of the vehicle and tried to compromise the matter, the petitioner has taken out his pistol and fired

two bullet shots on him, due to which he sustained injuries on his left shoulder. Pursuant thereto, statement of respondent No.2 came to the Police

Station for lodging FIR against the petitioner. Now, respondent No.2 entered into a compromise, on the basis of compromise deed, Annexure P-1,

stated that they do not want to pursue the case against the petitioner. Hence, the present petition.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner has argued that as the parties have compromised the matter, no purpose will be served by keeping the

proceedings against the petitioners and the FIR/Challan, may be quashed and set aside.

4. On the other hand, learned Additional Advocate General has argued that the offence is not compoundable, so the petition may be dismissed.

5. Learned counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, submits that the parties have entered into compromise and so, the proceedings pending before the

learned Court below may be quashed.

6. To appreciate the arguments of learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties, I have gone through the entire record in detail.

7. Their Lordships of the Honâ??ble Supreme CourtB .S. Joshi and others vs. State of Haryana and another, (2003) 4 SCC 675, have held that if for

the purpose of securing the ends of justice, quashing of FIR becomes necessary, Section 320 would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing.

It is well settled that the powers under section 482 have no limits. Of course, where there is more power, it becomes necessary to exercise utmost

care and caution while invoking such powers. Their Lordships have held as under:

[6] In Pepsi Food Ltd. and another v. Special Judicial Magistrate and others ((1998) 5 SCC 749,) this Court with reference to Bhajan Lal's case

observed that the guidelines laid therein as to where the Court will exercise jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code could not be inflexible or laying

rigid formulae to be followed by the Courts. Exercise of such power would

depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case but with the sole purpose to prevent abuse of the process of any Court or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. It is well settled that these powers have no limits. Of course, where there is more power, it becomes necessary to exercise utmost care and caution while invoking such powers.

[8] It is, thus, clear that Madhu Limaye's case does not lay down any general proposition limiting power of quashing the criminal proceedings or FIR or

complaint as vested in Section 482 of the Code or extraordinary power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India. We are, therefore, of the view

that if for the purpose of securing the ends of justice, quashing of FIR becomes necessary, Section 320 would not be a bar to the exercise of power of

quashing. It is, however, a different matter depending upon the facts and circumstances of each case whether to exercise or not such a power.

[15] In view of the above discussion, we hold that the High Court in exercise of its inherent powers can quash criminal proceedings or FIR or

complaint and Section 320 of the Code does not limit or affect the powers under Section 482 of the Code.

8. Their Lordships of the Honâ??ble Supreme Court in *Preeti Gupta and another vs. State of Jharkhand and another*, (2010) 7 SCC 667, have held

that the ultimate object of justice is to find out the truth and punish the guilty and protect the innocent. The tendency of implicating the husband and all

his immediate relations is also not uncommon. At times, even after the conclusion of the criminal trial, it is difficult to ascertain the real truth.

Experience reveals that long and protracted criminal trials lead to rancour, acrimony and bitterness in the relationship amongst the parties. The criminal

trials lead to immense sufferings for all concerned. Their Lordships have further held that permitting complainant to pursue complaint would be abuse

of process of law and the complaint against the appellants was quashed. Their Lordships have held as under:

[27] A three-Judge Bench (of which one of us, Bhandari, J. was the author of the judgment) of this Court in *Inder Mohan Goswami and Another v.*

State of Uttaranchal & Others, 2007 12 SCC 1 comprehensively examined the legal position. The court came to a definite conclusion and the relevant

observations of the court are reproduced in para 24 of the said judgment as under:-

Inherent powers under section 482 Cr.P.C. though wide have to be exercised sparingly, carefully and with great caution and only when such exercise is justified by the tests specifically laid down in this section itself. Authority of the court exists for the advancement of justice. If any abuse of the process leading to injustice is brought to the notice of the court, then the Court would be justified in preventing injustice by invoking inherent powers in absence of specific provisions in the Statute.

[28] We have very carefully considered the averments of the complaint and the statements of all the witnesses recorded at the time of the filing of the complaint. There are no specific allegations against the appellants in the complaint and none of the witnesses have alleged any role of both the appellants.

[35] The ultimate object of justice is to find out the truth and punish the guilty and protect the innocent. To find out the truth is a herculean task in majority of these complaints. The tendency of implicating husband and all his immediate relations is also not uncommon. At times, even after the conclusion of criminal trial, it is difficult to ascertain the real truth. The courts have to be extremely careful and cautious in dealing with these complaints and must take pragmatic realities into consideration while dealing with matrimonial cases. The allegations of harassment of husband's close relations who had been living in different cities and never visited or rarely visited the place where the complainant resided would have an entirely different complexion. The allegations of the complaint are required to be scrutinized with great care and circumspection.

[36] Experience reveals that long and protracted criminal trials lead to rancour, acrimony and bitterness in the relationship amongst the parties. It is also a matter of common knowledge that in cases filed by the complainant if the husband or the husband's relations had to remain in jail even for a few days, it would ruin the chances of amicable settlement altogether. The process of suffering is extremely long and painful.

[37] Before parting with this case, we would like to observe that a serious relook of the entire provision is warranted by the legislature. It is also a matter of common knowledge that exaggerated versions of the incident are reflected in a large number of complaints. The tendency of over implication is also reflected in a very large number of cases. The criminal trials

lead to immense sufferings for all concerned. Even ultimate acquittal in the trial may also not be able to wipe out the deep scars of suffering of ignominy. Unfortunately a large number of these complaints have not only flooded the courts but also have led to enormous social unrest affecting peace, harmony and happiness of the society. It is high time that the legislature must take into consideration the pragmatic realities and make suitable changes in the existing law. It is imperative for the legislature to take into consideration the informed public opinion and the pragmatic realities in consideration and make necessary changes in the relevant provisions of law.

[38] We direct the Registry to send a copy of this judgment to the Law Commission and to the Union Law Secretary, Government of India who may place it before the Hon'ble Minister for Law & Justice to take appropriate steps in the larger interest of the society.

9. Their Lordships of the Honâ??ble Supreme Court in *J itendra Raghuvanshi and others vs. Babita Raghuvanshi and another*, (2013) 4 SCC 58, have

held that criminal proceedings or FIR or complaint can be quashed under Section 482 Cr. P.C. in appropriate cases in order to meet ends of justice.

Even in non-compoundable offences pertaining to matrimonial disputes, if court is satisfied that parties have settled the disputes amicably and without

any pressure, then for purpose of securing ends of justice, FIR or complaint or subsequent criminal proceedings in respect of offences can be

quashed. Their Lordships have held as under:

[13] As stated earlier, it is not in dispute that after filing of a complaint in respect of the offences punishable under Sections 498A and 406 of IPC, the

parties, in the instant case, arrived at a mutual settlement and the complainant also has sworn an affidavit supporting the stand of the appellants. That

was the position before the trial Court as well as before the High Court in a petition filed under Section 482 of the Code. A perusal of the impugned

order of the High Court shows that because the mutual settlement arrived at between the parties relate to non-compoundable offence, the court

proceeded on a wrong premise that it cannot be compounded and dismissed the petition filed under Section 482. A perusal of the petition before the

High Court shows that the application filed by the appellants was not for compounding of non-compoundable offences but for the purpose of quashing

the criminal proceedings.

[14] The inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 of the Code are wide and unfettered. In B.S. Joshi , this Court has upheld the powers

of the High Court under Section 482 to quash criminal proceedings where dispute is of a private nature and a compromise is entered into between the

parties who are willing to settle their differences amicably. We are satisfied that the said decision is directly applicable to the case on hand and the

High Court ought to have quashed the criminal proceedings by accepting the settlement arrived at.

[15] In our view, it is the duty of the courts to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes, particularly, when the same are on considerable

increase. Even if the offences are non-compoundable, if they relate to matrimonial disputes and the court is satisfied that the parties have settled the

same amicably and without any pressure, we hold that for the purpose of securing ends of justice, Section 320 of the Code would not be a bar to the

exercise of power of quashing of FIR, complaint or the subsequent criminal proceedings.

[16] There has been an outburst of matrimonial disputes in recent times. The institution of marriage occupies an important place and it has an

important role to play in the society. Therefore, every effort should be made in the interest of the individuals in order to enable them to settle down in

life and live peacefully. If the parties ponder over their defaults and terminate their disputes amicably by mutual agreement instead of fighting it out in

a court of law, in order to do complete justice in the matrimonial matters, the courts should be less hesitant in exercising its extraordinary jurisdiction. It

is trite to state that the power under Section 482 should be exercised sparingly and with circumspection only when the court is convinced, on the basis

of material on record, that allowing the proceedings to continue would be an abuse of the process of the court or that the ends of justice require that

the proceedings ought to be quashed. We also make it clear that exercise of such power would depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case

and it has to be exercised in appropriate cases in order to do real and substantial justice for the administration of which alone the courts exist. It is the

duty of the courts to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes and Section 482 of the Code enables the High Court and Article 142 of

the Constitution enables this Court to pass such orders.

[17] In the light of the above discussion, we hold that the High Court in exercise of its inherent powers can quash the criminal proceedings or FIR or

complaint in appropriate cases in order to meet the ends of justice and Section 320 of the Code does not limit or affect the powers of the High Court

under Section 482 of the Code. Under these circumstances, we set aside the impugned judgment of the High Court dated 04.07.2012 passed in

M.C.R.C. No. 2877 of 2012 and quash the proceedings in Criminal Case No. 4166 of 2011 pending on the file of Judicial Magistrate Class-I,

Indore.â??

10. Similarly, Honâ??ble Supreme Court in Parbatbhai Aahir alias Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and others vs. State of Gujarat and another,

(2017) 9 Supreme Court Cases 641, wherein it has been held as under:

â??16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice.

The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court;

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a First Information Report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement

has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence.

While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The

power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High

Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power;

16.4 While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to

prevent an abuse of the process of any court;

16.5 The decision as to whether a complaint or First Information Report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the

dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated;

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due

regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity

cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in

nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public

interest in punishing persons for serious offences;

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute.

They stand on a distinct footing in so far as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned;

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil

flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute;

16.9 In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a

conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8 and 16.9 above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic

well-being of the state have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified

in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act

complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.

Even if, the trial is allowed to be continued, as the parties have compromised the matter, there are bleak chances of conviction to secure the ends of

justice.

11. Thus, taking into consideration the law as discussed hereinabove, I find that the interest of justice will be met, in case, the proceedings are

quashed, as the parties have already compromised the matter

12. Accordingly, looking into all attending facts and circumstances, I find this case to be a fit case to exercise jurisdiction vested in this Court, under

Section 482 of the Code and accordingly F.I.R No. 400 of 2016, dated 28.12.2016, under Section 307 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 25-54-59

of Arms Act, registered at Police Station, Nurpur, District Kangra, is ordered to be quashed and consequently, the proceedings pending before the

learned Trial Court, arising out of the aforesaid FIR, are also ordered to be quashed.

13. The petition is accordingly disposed of alongwith pending applications, if any.