

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
+ CRL.M.C. 185/2016

Date of Decision : April 19th, 2016

KRISHAN KUMAR & ORS Petitioners
Through Mr.Naresh Kumar, Adv.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondent
Through Mr.K.K. Ghai, APP for the State.
Ms.Suman Sharma, Adv. with
Respondent No.2 in person.

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 petitioners, namely, Sh. Krishan Kumar, Sh. Vijay Kumar, Smt. Sona Devi, Sh. Kamal Kumar @ Babli, Smt. Manisha, Smt. Mamta @ Poonam, Smt. Madhu Kishore and Sh. Rahul for quashing of FIR No.326/2014 dated 06.12.2014 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station Chandni Mahal on the basis of the settlement agreement executed in the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi between the petitioner nos.1 & 3 and respondent no.2, namely, Smt. Lalita on 16.04.2015.
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 in the FIR in question by her counsel.

3. The factual matrix of the present case is that the marriage between the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 was solemnized on 20.11.2013. Right from the beginning of the marriage, the accused persons had been committing utmost cruelties on the complainant and cursing her on one pretext or the other. The husband of the complainant was alleged to have very dirty habits as even on the second day of the marriage, he came home drunk and abused the complainant. The father-in-law of the complainant also used to keep evil eyes on the complainant and used to touch the complainant on one pretext or the other. On one incident, the complainant was beaten up badly by her husband and mother-in-law and was not provided food. The accused persons even stated to the complainant that they wish the complainant would die due to electric shock as she had not brought AC car/ gas cylinder/ laptop etc. The husband and the mother-in-law of the complainant even threatened her by saying that if she does not bring dowry then they would sell all the dowry articles she had received in marriage. On 20.04.2014, the complainant was tortured and was turned out of the matrimonial house. The entire stridhan of the complainant was kept by her in-laws and was not returned to her.

The respondent no.2/complainant lodged a complaint which resulted into the registration of the FIR in question against the petitioners. Thereafter, there matter was referred to the mediation centre and both the parties settled all their disputes qua their marriage.

4. Respondent No.2, present in the Court, submitted that the

dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved. As per the settlement agreement, it has been agreed that petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 shall dissolve their marriage by decree of divorce by mutual consent. It is also agreed that the petitioner no.1 shall pay Rs. 6.5 Lakhs and that he shall return all the items in good condition as enunciated in the terms of the agreement to respondent no.2 towards all legal entitlements past, present and future arising out of the marriage which shall include permanent alimony maintenance, istridhan, maintenance of the child till his age of majority as per law and all other miscellaneous and legal expenses. It is also agreed that if the articles to be returned are not done so in good condition then the petitioner no.1 shall pay in cash, the amount, as per the bill of the respective article. It is also agreed that aforesaid articles shall be returned at the time of recording of statement of first motion. It is also agreed that the petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 shall initiate appropriate legal proceedings for quashing of the FIRs mentioned in the terms of the agreement including the FIR in question and all other consequential proceedings arising out of the said FIRs within 55 days of the dissolution of marriage and at that time petitioner no.1 shall pay the balance amount of Rs. 2 Lakhs by way of DD/Cash to respondent no.2. It is also agreed that petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 and their respective family members shall withdraw their respective cases and complaints filed in the different Courts on their next date of hearings. It is also agreed that petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 shall cooperate in the execution of the terms and conditions of this settlement. It is also agreed that petitioner no.1 shall withdraw the

complaint made against respondent no.2 before the Commissioner of Police after recording of statement in first motion. It is also agreed that after this settlement, there shall remain no dispute due between the parties arising out of the said marriage and that none of the parties or their family members shall file or contest any civil or criminal proceedings against each other in future and that if any other case/petition/complaint etc. between the parties is pending in any Court or Authority, the same shall be withdrawn/got disposed of by the respective party. It is also agreed that if any delay is caused by petitioner no.1 in filing of quashing petition, then petitioner no.1 shall pay a sum of Rs. 5,000/- monthly to respondent no.2 till the filing of the quashing petition. It is also agreed that the matter pending before the Court of Sh. Dilbagh Singh Punia, under Section 125 Cr.P.C. shall be withdrawn by the respondent no.2 after recording of statement in the first motion petition on the date fixed i.e. 19.05.2015 and that in case the compromise fails then the said petition shall be revived. It is also agreed that the matter pending before the LD. MM under Section 12 DV Act and the execution of petition shall be withdrawn by the respondent no.2 after recording of the statement of the second motion. It is also agreed that the FIR bearing no. 558/2015, under Sections 323/341/34 IPC, PS Anand Parvat, FIR bearing no.559/2015, under Sections 323/341/34 IPC, PS Anand Parvat and FIR in question pending before the Court of Sh. Deepak Dabas, ACMM shall be compounded by the parties as mentioned above after the recording of statement in second motion. It is also agreed that the FIR bearing no. 230/2014, under Sections 213/341/34/506 IPC, PS Kamla Market shall

be compounded/quashed by respondent no.2 from the concerned Court after recording of statement in second motion petition. Respondent No.2 affirmed the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of her affidavit dated 05.01.2016 supporting this petition. In the affidavit, the respondent no.2 has stated that she has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed. All the disputes and differences have been resolved through mutual consent. Now no dispute with petitioners 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 stated that she has entered into a compromise with the petitioners and has settled all the disputes with them. She further stated that she has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

5. 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.”

6. 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.

7. 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 without any threat or coercion or undue influence and has stated that the matter has been settled out of her own free will. 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.

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. It is a well settled law that where the High Court is convinced that the offences are entirely personal in nature and therefore do not affect public peace or tranquillity and where it feels that quashing of such proceedings on account of compromise would bring about peace and would secure ends of justice, it should not hesitate to quash them. In such cases, pursuing prosecution would be waste of time and energy. Non-compoundable offences are basically an obstruction in entering into compromise. In certain cases, the main offence is compoundable but the connected offences are not. In the case of *B.S. Joshi and others v. State of Haryana and another* 2003 (4) SCC 675 the Hon'ble Apex Court observed that even though the provisions of Section 320 Cr.P.C. would not apply to such offences which are not compoundable, it did not limit or affect the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The Hon'ble Apex Court laid down that if for the purpose of securing the ends of justice, quashing of FIR becomes necessary, section 320 Cr.P.C. would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing. In the nutshell, the Hon'ble Apex Court justified the exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the

proceedings to secure the ends of justice in view of the special facts and circumstances of the case, even where the offences were non-compoundable.

In the light of the aforesaid, this Court is of the view that notwithstanding the fact the offence under Section 498A IPC is a non-compoundable offence, there should be no impediment in quashing the FIR under this section, if the Court is otherwise satisfied that the facts and circumstances of the case so warrant.

11. *The Courts in India are now normally taking the view that endeavour should be taken to promote conciliation and secure speedy settlement of disputes relating to marriage and family affairs such as, matrimonial disputes between the couple or/and between the wife and her in-laws. India being a vast country naturally has large number of married persons resulting into high numbers of matrimonial disputes due to differences in temperament, life-styles, opinions, thoughts etc. between such couples, due to which majority is coming to the Court to get redressal. In its 59th report, the Law Commission of India had emphasized that while dealing with disputes concerning the family, the Court ought to adopt an approach radically different from that adopted in ordinary civil proceedings and that it should make reasonable efforts at settlement before the commencement of the trial. Further it is also the constitutional mandate for speedy disposal of such disputes and to grant quick justice to the litigants. But, our Courts are already over burdened due to pendency of large number of cases because of which it becomes difficult for speedy disposal of matrimonial disputes alone. As the matrimonial disputes are mainly*

between the husband and the wife and personal matters are involved in such disputes, so, it requires conciliatory procedure to bring a settlement between them. Nowadays, mediation has played a very important role in settling the disputes, especially, matrimonial disputes and has yielded good results. The Court must exercise its inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to put an end to the matrimonial litigations at the earliest so that the parties can live peacefully.

12. Since the subject matter of this FIR is essentially matrimonial, which now stands mutually and amicably settled between the parties, therefore, continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility and is a fit case for this Court to exercise its inherent jurisdiction.

13. In the facts and circumstances of this case, in view of statement made by the respondent no.2 and the compromise arrived at between the parties, the FIR in question warrants to be put to an end and proceedings emanating thereupon need to be quashed.

14. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and FIR No.326/2014 dated 06.12.2014 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station Chandni Mahal and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioners.

15. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

APRIL 19, 2016/dd