

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 771/2016**

Date of Decision: May 16th, 2016
ROHIT KAUSHIK & ANR Petitioners
Through Mr.Abhinav Bajaj, Adv.
versus
STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondents
Through Mr.Izhar Ahmad, APP for the State
with SI Jitendra Kumar, PS
Govindpuri.
Mr.Arnab Bhattacharya, 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. Rohit Kaushik and Sh. Mohit Kaushik for quashing of FIR No.300/2013 dated 08.05.2013, under Sections 498A/34 IPC registered at Police Station Govind Puri on the basis of settlement arrived at the Counseling Cell, South Family Court, Saket Court Complex, New Delhi between petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2, Smt. Neetu Kumari on 10.04.2015.
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 petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 was solemnized in November, 2003. The family of the husband of the complainant would keep demanding money from the complainant. They would keep

trying to persuade the husband of the complainant to leave the complainant and remarry somebody rich. On 04.11.2011 the maternal uncle and brother of the husband of the complainant came to the complainant's home at night picked up a brawl with the complainant and slapped her on her cheek and threw her against the wall because of which she sustained injuries on her forehead. On 23.12.2011, husband of the complainant left the house on a false pretext and never came back home. The complainant and her father went to petitioner no.1's house in the village, where complainant and her father were told that his family was unaware of petitioner no.1's whereabouts.

Thereafter, respondent no.2/complainant lodged a complaint which resulted into the registration of the FIR in question against the petitioners. Numerous litigations followed, during the pendency of which the parties settled before a Counseling Cell.

4. Respondent No.2, present in the Court, submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved. As per the settlement, it is agreed that the parties shall take divorce by way of mutual consent within the jurisdiction of Delhi Court. It is agreed that the petitioner no.1 shall pay the total settlement amount of Rs. 6.5 Lacs towards full and final settlement including past, present and future maintenance and permanent alimony and any other legal claims. It is also agreed that the petitioner no.1 shall pay Rs. 1.5 Lakhs to respondent no.2 at the time of recording of the statement of first motion. It is further agreed between the parties that petitioner no.1 shall pay a sum of Rs. 1.5 Lakhs to respondent no.2 at the time of recording of statement of second motion. It is also agreed that the first

motion petition shall be filed on or before 10.04.2015 and the second motion shall be filed soon after the completion of the period of 6 months under Section 13 B(1) H.M.A. It is also agreed that the parties will withdraw the cases pending in the concerned Courts as mentioned in detail in the terms of the settlement. It is also agreed that the FIR in question shall be quashed by filing a petition before this Court and that respondent no.2 shall cooperate for the same. It is also agreed that at the time of quashing of the FIR in question, petitioner no.1 shall pay a sum of Rs. 1.5 Lakhs to respondent no.2. It is also agreed that respondent no.2 shall cooperate in the quashing of the Rape complaint under Section 376 IPC and that at the time of quashing of the same petitioner no.1 shall pay respondent no.2 a sum of Rs. 2 Lakhs. It is also agreed that the matter has been settled between the parties and that they shall not back out from the terms of the settlement. It is also agreed that neither of the parties shall file any criminal or civil cases regarding this litigation. Respondent No.2 affirmed the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of her affidavit dated 29.01.2016 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 tranquility 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 overburdened 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.300/2013 dated 08.05.2013, under Sections 498A/34 IPC registered at Police Station Govind Puri and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioners.

15. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

MAY 16, 2016
dd



(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE