
(2020) 02 P&H CK 0145

In the Punjab And Haryana At Chandigarh

Case No : Criminal Main No. 41579-2019 (O&M)

Surjit Singh Bagga @ Dodhi And Others

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Punjab And Another

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 20-02-2020

Acts Referred:

Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 120B, 420

Punjab Prevention Of Human Smuggling Act, 2012 — Section 13

Code Of Criminal Procedure 1973 — Section 320, 482

Citation : (2020) 02 P&H CK 0145

Hon'ble Judges : Arvind Singh Sangwan, J

Bench : Single Bench

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

Arvind Singh Sangwan, J

The petitioners have prayed for quashing of FIR No.165 dated 31.07.2019 for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 120-B of the Indian Penal

Code ('IPC' for short) and Section 13 of Punjab Prevention of Human Smuggling Act, 2012, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District

Kapurthala and all the subsequent proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise effected between the parties.

Vide order dated 26.09.2019, the parties were directed to appear before the trial Court/Illaqa Magistrate to get their statements recorded with regard

to genuineness of the compromise.

A report dated 21.10.2019 has been submitted by the Sub Divisional Judicial Magistrate, Sultanpur Lodhi, wherein it has been reported that statements

of the petitioners and respondent No.2 have been recorded and statements made by the parties in the Court reveal that they have voluntarily entered

into a compromise and the Court is satisfied that the parties have amicably settled their dispute without any fear, pressure, threat or coercion and out of their free will. It is further reported that no other criminal case is pending between the parties and none of the petitioner is a proclaimed offender.

Since in view of resolution of the Bar that due to sad demise of Dr. Jolly Sharma, Advocate, work shall remain suspended today i.e. 20.02.2020 in the post-lunch session, there is no representation on behalf of the parties.

I have perused the case file.

As per the Full Bench judgment of this Court in Kulwinder Singh and others Vs. State of Punjab, 2007 (3) RCR (Criminal) 105,2 it is held that the

High Court has power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to allow the compounding of non-compoundable offence and quash the prosecution where the High

Court feel that the same was required to prevent the abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure the ends of justice. This power of quashing is

not confined to matrimonial disputes alone.

Hon'ble the Apex Court in the case of Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another, 2012 (4) RCR (Criminal) 543, has held as under:-

â??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 victimâ??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 predominatingly 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.â??

Since the parties have arrived at a compromise and have decided to live in peace, no useful purpose would be served in allowing the criminal

proceedings to continue.

In view of what has been discussed hereinabove, present petition is allowed and FIR No.165 dated 31.07.2019 under Sections 420, 120-B IPC and

Section 13 of Punjab Prevention of Human Smuggling Act, 2012, registered at Police Station Sultanpur Lodhi, District Kapurthala and all the

subsequent proceedings arising therefrom are ordered to be quashed qua the petitioners, however, subject to payment of costs of Rs.5,000/- to be

deposited with the District Legal Services Authority, Kapurthala.