

(2019) 08 UK CK 0168

In the Uttarakhand High Court

Case No : Criminal Miscellaneous Application Application (C-482) No. 1107 Of 2019, Compounding Application (CRMA No. 1721 Of 2019)

Sharafat Ali

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Uttarakhand & Others

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 26-08-2019

Acts Referred:

Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 320, 482
Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 354, 419, 452, 506

Citation : (2019) 08 UK CK 0168

Hon'ble Judges : R.C. Khulbe, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Raj Kumar Singh, S.S. Adhikari, P.S. Uniyal, Preeta Bhatt, Radha Arya

Final Decision : Disposed Of

Judgement

R.C. Khulbe, J

1. By way of present application, moved under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. the applicant seeks to quash impugned charge sheet dated 26.02.2019, impugned summoning order dated 15.05.2019 and entire proceedings of criminal case no.2855 of 2019, "State Vs. Sharafat Ali", under Sections 452, 354, 506, 419 IPC, registered at P.S. Nehru Colony, District Dehradun, pending before learned court of A.C.J.M. Vth, Dehradun in terms of compromise arrived between the parties.

2. After perusal of the FIR, it would reveal that respondent no.2 lodged FIR No. 0020 of 2019 on 21.01.2019 under Sections 452, 354 and 506 IPC at P.S. Nehru Colony, Dehradun against the applicant. After the investigation, the police filed charge sheet under Sections 452, 354, 506, 419 IPC on 26.02.2019.

3. The parties have filed a Compounding Application no. 1721 of 2019 to show that the parties have buried their differences and have settled their disputes amicably.

4. It is contended by learned counsel for the State that the offences punishable under Sections 452, 354 IPC are non-compoundable offences.

5. Learned counsel for the parties also drew the attention of this Court towards the ruling of *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and another*, (2013) 1 SCC (Cri) 160, in which Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as below:

"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-dominantly civil flavour stand on 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, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put 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 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 affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding."

6. Parties are are duly identified by their respective counsel.

7. Considering the fact that the offences punishable under Sections 452, 354 IPC are non-compoundable offences and also the fact that complainant has filed an affidavit stating that the matter has been settled amicably between the parties, it would be just and appropriate to allow the present compounding applications in the interest of justice.

8. Accordingly, the compounding application is allowed. The entire proceedings of criminal case no.2855 of 2019, "State Vs. Sharafat Ali", under Sections 452, 354, 506, 419 IPC, registered at P.S. Nehru Colony, District Dehradun, pending before learned court of A.C.J.M. Vth, Dehradun along with impugned charge sheet dated 26.02.2019 and impugned summoning order dated 15.05.2019 is hereby quashed, qua the present applicant only, on the basis of compromise arrived among the parties.

9. Present C482 application stands disposed of, as above.

10. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of accordingly.