

I-10 & 11

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

Date of Decision: May 12, 2015

+ **CRL.M.C. 510/2015**

SATYA PARKASH MEENA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajiv Mishra, Advocate
(proxy)

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr.Naveen Sharma, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State with SI Tribhuvan Negi
Respondent No.2 in person

+ **CRL.M.C. 517/2015**

KRISHAN KUMAR & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajiv Mishra, Advocate
(proxy)

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr.Naveen Sharma, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State with SI Tribhuvan Negi
Respondent No.2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

JUDGMENT
(ORAL)

%

In the above captioned first petition, quashing of FIR No.356/2013, under Sections 186/353/332/34 of the IPC & Section 40 of *Delhi Excise Act* [in Crl. M.C. No. 510/2015] & in the above captioned second petition, quashing of FIR No.357/2013, under Sections 323/341/308/34 of the IPC [in Crl. M.C. No. 517/2015], both registered at police station Dwarka, Delhi is sought by petitioners on the basis of Memorandum of Understanding of 1st November, 2014 (*Annexure-G in Crl. M.C.No.510/2015*).

Since the two FIRs in question are cross FIRs and their quashing is sought on identical grounds, therefore, both these petitions have been heard together and are being disposed of by this common judgment.

Mr. Naveen Sharma, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submits that injured/respondent No.2-*Krishan Kumar* is the first informant of FIR No.356/2013 and injured/ respondent No.2-*Satya Prakash Meena* is the first-informant of FIR No.357/2013 and they are present in the Court and they have been identified to be so by SI Tribhuvan Negi, Investigating Officer of these cases.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State submits on instructions that the trial of this FIR case has not yet begun.

Complainants- *Krishan Kuamr & Satya Prakash Meena*, present in the Court, submit that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved vide aforesaid Memorandum of Understanding of 1st November, 2014 (*Annexure-G*) and the misunderstanding, which led to registration of FIR in question, now stands cleared between the parties. They affirm the contents of their affidavit in support of this petition and submit that the

proceedings arising out of the FIRs in question be brought to an end.

In '*Gian Singh Vs State of Punjab*' (2012) 10 SCC 303, Apex Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes in cases like the instant one, by observing as under:-

“Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.

Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor.”

The aforesaid dictum stands reiterated by the Apex Court in a recent judgment in *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab* (2014) 6 SCC 466. The pertinent observations of the Apex Court in *Narinder Singh (supra)* are as under:-

29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482

of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1 *Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.*

29.2. *When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:*

(i) ends of justice, or

(ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. *Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that*

capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.

29.6. Offences under Section 307 IPC would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore are to be generally treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of Section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of Section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to proving the charge under Section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delegate parts of the body, nature of

weapons used, etc. Medical report in respect of injuries suffered by the victim can generally be the guiding factor. On the basis of this prima facie analysis, the High Court can examine as to whether there is a strong possibility of conviction or the chances of conviction are remote and bleak. In the former case it can refuse to accept the settlement and quash the criminal proceedings whereas in the latter case it would be permissible for the High Court to accept the plea compounding the offence based on complete settlement between the parties. At this stage, the Court can also be swayed by the fact that the settlement between the parties is going to result in harmony between them which may improve their future relationship.

29.7. While deciding whether to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Code or not, timings of settlement play a crucial role. Those cases where the settlement is arrived at immediately after the alleged commission of offence and the matter is still under investigation, the High Court may be liberal in accepting the settlement to quash the criminal proceedings/investigation. It is because of the reason that at this stage the investigation is still on and even the charge-sheet has not been filed. Likewise, those cases where the charge is framed but the evidence is yet to start or the evidence is still at infancy stage, the High Court can show benevolence in exercising its powers favourably, but after prima facie assessment of the circumstances/material mentioned above. On the other hand, where the prosecution evidence is almost

complete or after the conclusion of the evidence the matter is at the stage of argument, normally the High Court should refrain from exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code, as in such cases the trial court would be in a position to decide the case finally on merits and to come to a conclusion as to whether the offence under Section 307 IPC is committed or not. Similarly, in those cases where the conviction is already recorded by the trial court and the matter is at the appellate stage before the High Court, mere compromise between the parties would not be a ground to accept the same resulting in acquittal of the offender who has already been convicted by the trial court. Here charge is proved under Section 307 IPC and conviction is already recorded of a heinous crime and, therefore, there is no question of sparing a convict found guilty of such a crime.”

In view of the fact that the misunderstanding between the parties stands amicably and mutually cleared, this Court finds that continuance of proceedings arising out of these cross FIRs would be an exercise in futility.

Accordingly both these petitions are allowed and proceedings arising out of FIR No.356/2013, under Sections 186/353/332/34 of the IPC & Section 40 of *Delhi Excise Act* [in CrI. M.C. No. 510/2015] & FIR No.357/2013, under Sections 323/341/308/34 of the IPC [in CrI. M.C. No. 517/2015], both registered at police station Dwarka, Delhi are quashed qua petitioners.

The above captioned two petitions are accordingly disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

MAY 12, 2015

r