

\$~15

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 913/2016**

AMAN SHARMA & ORS. Petitioners

Through: Mr.M.H. Rehman, Advocate.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr.Ashish Aggarwal, A.S.C. for the
State with SI Chetan Mandia, PS
Sagarpur.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

% **27.04.2016**

Crl.M.A.5024/2016

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 913/2016

1. By way of present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., the petitioners seek quashing of FIR bearing No.214/2013 under Sections 498A/34 IPC, P.S. Sagarpur, Delhi and all the proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Brief facts leading to filing of this petition are that marriage between petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2/complainant was solemnized on 17.04.2003 at Delhi according to Hindu rites and ceremonies. Out of the said wedlock, baby Pushpanjali was born. It is stated in the petition that after the marriage the parties lived together as husband and wife but due to differences they could not live together and started living separately.

W.P.(CRL) 913//2016

Page 1 of 4

Thereafter, the respondent No.2 lodged a complaint, on the basis of which a case FIR bearing No.214/2013 under Sections 498A/34 IPC, P.S. Sagarpur, Delhi was registered against the petitioners.

3. It is also stated that during the pendency of proceedings, due to involvement of elderly and respectable relatives of the parties have amicably arrived at a settlement.

4. Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioner No.1 and the respondent No.2 have amicably resolved their dispute with the intervention of elderly and respectable relatives of the parties and that the petitioner No.1-husband and respondent No.2-wife have now once again started living together peacefully and they are taking care of their child, no useful purpose would be served by continuance of criminal proceedings against the petitioners. Counsel thus prays for quashing of the FIR and all subsequent proceedings arising out of said FIR qua the petitioners. Respondent No.2 is present in Court today and she also confirms the factum of amicable settlement with the petitioners. She submits that she has now started living together with the petitioner No.1 and she has no grievance left against the petitioners. She further submits that she has no objection if the FIR in question and all subsequent proceedings arising out of the same are quashed.

5. The FIR registered against the present Petitioners is for committing the offences punishable under Sections 498-A/34 IPC. Offence punishable under Section 498-A IPC is a non-compoundable offence. In the decision in the case of ***Gian Singh v State of Punjab & Anr. 2012 (9) SCALE 257***, the three Judges Bench of the Supreme Court dealing with the issue of quashing of FIR has observed as under:-

“57. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be
W.P.(CRL) 913//2016

summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences Under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity etc; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominantly civil favour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. 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 proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and 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 affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

6. In view of the legal position laid down in *Gian Singh's case* (Supra) and the fact that the parties are living together happily with their child, I am of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by continuing with the FIR/criminal proceedings against the petitioners, which will only be an exercise in futility and wastage of precious time of the Court.

7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and FIR bearing No.214/2013 under Sections 498A/34 IPC, P.S. Sagarpur, Delhi and all the proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed, leaving the parties to bear their own costs.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

APRIL 27, 2016
'hkaur/da'