

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 703/2016**

Date of Decision : May 30th, 2016

HARBIR LAKRA

..... Petitioner

Through

Mr.Rajiv Mohan, Adv. with
Mr.Abhimanyu Kampani, Adv.

versus

STATE & ANR

..... Respondents

Through

Ms.Meenakshi Chauhan, APP for the
State with SI Balwant Singh, PS
Mundka.
Mr.Abhimanyu Kampani, 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 petitioner, namely, Sh. Harbir Lakra for quashing of FIR No.108/2012 dated 17.05.2012, under Sections 323/324 IPC registered at Police Station Mundka on the basis of the Memorandum of Settlement arrived at between the petitioner (along with Sh. Sukhbir Singh and Smt. Birmati) and respondent no.2, namely, Smt. Ujjwal Dahiya on 21.01.2016 at Delhi.

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 FIR in question was lodged by the complainant on the allegation that the husband of the complainant i.e. the petitioner has been constantly harassing her mentally and physically since 2 years. On 10.05.2012, the petitioner gave brutal beatings to the complainant. The complainant works as a tutor in a college of Nursing, AIIMS and travel by metro. The complainant returned home at 6pm, on 10.05.2012 and as soon as the complainant entered the house, her husband abused her. The petitioner informed her that he has filed a divorce petition against her on 12.04.2012. The petitioner then grabbed her and bit her face and told her that if she does not bring the dowry of Rs. 50 lacs, then he would kill her. The complainant informed the police and went for her medical. She was sent back at around 1.30am, but the door was locked. Thereafter, the petitioner came and unlocked the door, he pushed the complainant on the floor and gave several beatings on her face and hand. The petitioner even bit the complainant like an animal. The complainant then tried to run and came to the police.

Thereafter, both the parties managed to harmoniously settle all their differences with the help of family and friends.

4. Respondent No.2 present in the Court submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved. As per the Memorandum of Settlement, the petitioner and respondent no.2 have agreed to live together along with their daughter at any place of their choice including the matrimonial home, bearing No. 899, near metro station, khasra No. 250, vill. Mundka, Delhi 110041 and they have

decided to fully co-operate with each other and their respective family members for making their marriage a success. It is also agreed that Sh. Sukhbir Singh is the owner of house bearing No. 899, near metro station, khasra No. 250, vill. Mundka, Delhi 110041; builtup property situated in Khasra No. 450/1/2, vill. Mundka, Delhi measuring 500 sq. yds. in the possession of Sh. Sukhbir Singh and builtup property situated in Khasra No. 428/4, Vill. Mundka, Delhi measuring 550 sq. yds. in the possession of Sh. Sukhbir Singh. It is also agreed that Sh. Sukhbir Singh has four sons including the petitioner and Sh. Sukhbir Singh has agreed to transfer 1/4 share out of the said properties in the name of petitioner and respondent no.2 who shall be joint owners. It is also agreed that Sh. Sukhbir Singh shall not create any third party interest regarding the 1/4 share of petitioner and respondent no.2 during his lifetime. The petitioner agreed to withdraw his divorce petition and FIR No. 102/12, P.S. Mundka. The respondent no.2 has agreed to withdraw her DV case; FIR No. 101/12, PS Mundka and FIR in question. The respondent no.2 also agreed to not prosecute the petitioner, Sh. Sukhbir Singh and Smt. Birmati in the FIR No. 127/12, PS Mundka and to extend full cooperation in getting the same quashed before this Court. The respondent no.2 has also agreed to withdraw her application under Section 24 & 26 HMA filed on behalf of her daughter at the time of the withdrawal of the divorce petition by the petitioner. It is also agreed that Lt. Col. Navneet Dahiya brother of respondent no.2 shall not prosecute the petitioner in the case under FIR No. 195/13, PS Mundka under Section 307 IPC and to co-operate in getting the same quashed before this Court and he shall execute a

separate Memorandum of Settlement with the petitioner in respect of FIR No. 195/13, PS Mundka under Section 307 IPC after he comes on leave in February 2016. It is agreed that the petitioner and respondent no.2 shall withdraw their respective cases on or before 10th February, 2016. It is also agreed that all the parties and their respective family members will withdraw any complaint/case file by them against others including Lt. Col. Navneet Dahiya before any Court of law and if not withdrawn the said complaint/case will be deemed withdrawn and the complainant party will not pursue the same under any circumstances. Respondent No.2 affirmed the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of her affidavit dated 16.02.2016 supporting this petition. In the affidavit, she 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 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 stated that she has entered into a compromise with the petitioner and has settled all the disputes with him. 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 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 that the offence under Section 324 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. In the facts and circumstances of this case and in view of statement 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.

12. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and FIR No.108/2012 dated 17.05.2012, under Sections 323/324 IPC registered at Police Station Mundka and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioner.

13. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

MAY 30, 2016/dd