

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 3161/2015**

Date of Decision : November 02nd, 2015

MUKESH TOKAS

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. U.M. Tripathi, Advocate

versus

THE STATE & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Vinod Diwakar, Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State with
Sub-Inspector Ranvir, Police Station
Vasant Vihar, Delhi.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.S.TEJI

P.S.TEJI, J.

1. The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed by the petitioner, namely, Smt. Mukesh Tokas for quashing of FIR No.196/2012 dated 29.06.2012, under Sections 406/420 IPC registered at Police Station Vasant Vihar on the basis of settlement report of Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre, Delhi High court, Delhi between the petitioner and respondent no.2, namely, Smt. Bool Devi on 29.09.2014.

2. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State

submitted that the respondent no.2, present in the Court has been identified to be the complainant/first-informant of the FIR in question by her counsel.

3. Respondent No.2 present in the Court, submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved. As per the settlement report, the parties have compromised the matter voluntarily. The parties are related to each other by blood. Also, that after the signing of the agreement, the parties have further agreed that respondent no.2 will cooperate and give a statement in favour of the petitioner at the time of her filing of quashing or withdrawal of the present criminal case. Respondent no.2 further agreed that she will not claim any title, possession and ownership to the property bearing No. 189-C, situated in village Munirka, Delhi. The respondent no.2 affirms the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of the affidavit dated 12.03.2015. As per the affidavit of respondent no.2, she has no objection to the quashing of the FIR in question. All the disputes and differences have been resolved through mutual consent. Now no dispute with petitioner survives and so, the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be brought to an end. Statement of the respondent

No.2 has been recorded in this regard in which she has stated that she has entered into a compromise with the petitioner and has settled all the disputes with her. She further stated that she has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

4. In *Gian Singh v. 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:-

“61. 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 proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings 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 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 proceedings.”

5. 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 relevant 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.

6. The inherent powers of the High Court ought to be exercised to prevent the abuse of process of law and to secure the ends of justice. The respondent no.2 agreed to the quashing of the FIR in question and has stated that the matter has been settled out of her own free will without any coercion, threat or promise. As the matter has been settled and compromised amicably, so, there would be an extraordinary delay in the process of law if the legal proceedings between the parties are carried on. So, this Court is of the considered opinion that this is a fit case to invoke the jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to prevent the abuse of process of law and to secure the ends of justice.

7. The incorporation of inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is meant to deal with the situation in the absence of express provision of law to secure the ends of justice such as, where the process is abused or misused; where the ends of justice cannot be secured; where the process of law is used for unjust or unlawful object; to avoid the causing of harassment to any person by using the provision of Cr.P.C. or to avoid the delay of the legal process in the delivery of

justice. Whereas, the inherent power is not to be exercised to circumvent the express provisions of law.

8. It is settled law that the inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. should be used sparingly. The Hon'ble Apex Court in the case of *State of Maharashtra through CBI v. Vikram Anatrai Doshi and Ors. MANU/SC/0842/2014* and in the case of *Inder Singh Goswami v. State of Uttaranchal MANU/SC/0808/2009* has observed that powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. must be exercised sparingly, carefully and with great caution. Only when the Court comes to the conclusion that there would be manifest injustice or there would be abuse of the process of the Court if such power is not exercised, Court would quash the proceedings.

9. The offences in the present case under Section 406/420 IPC are offences which are compoundable with the permission of the Court as per Section 320 Cr.P.C. In the light of the settlement arrived at between the parties, this Court does not find any reason to not permit the quashing of the FIR in question by compounding the said offence.

10. In the facts and circumstances of this case and in view of statements made by the respondent No.2, the FIR in question warrants

to be put to an end and proceedings emanating thereupon need to be quashed.

11. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and FIR No.196/2012 dated 29.06.2012, under Sections 406/420 IPC registered at Police Station Vasant Vihar and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioner.

12. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

NOVEMBER 02, 2015
dd