

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1332/2016 & CrI.M.A. No. 7942/2016**

Date of Decision : May 19th, 2016

ANKIT TANEJA & ORS

..... Petitioner

Through: **M. L. Ojha, Mr. Kulvinder Singh, Mr.
Manvinder Singh, Advocates**

versus

THE STATE OF GOVT OF NCT DELHI & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: **Mr. Kamal Kumar Ghai, Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State with
Inspector Arun Chauhan, Sub-
Inspector Gaurav Panwar, Police
Station Geeta Colony, 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 petitioners, namely, Sh. Ankit Taneja, Smt. Usha, Shikha Sethi and Sh. Gagan Sethi for quashing of FIR No.224/2012 dated 02.08.2012, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station New Ashok Nagar on the basis of the mediation report arrived at the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi between petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2, namely, Smt. Nidhi Taneja on 13.04.2015.

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 14.05.2011 according to Hindu rites and customs. The parents of the complainant had spent around 22 lacs in the marriage but her husband and in-laws were not happy and after the marriage, they all started harassing and torturing the complainant for dowry. The accused persons even tried to kill the complainant 2-3 times. When the father of the complainant came to her matrimonial house to talk to her in-laws, the complainant was thrown out of her matrimonial home. Thereafter, the complainant took a house on rent but after that also her husband and her in-laws kept on threatening her.

The respondent no.2/complainant lodged a complaint alleging cruelty against the petitioners which resulted into the registration of the FIR in question against the petitioners. The respondent no.2/complainant lodged a complaint under Section 12 D.V.Act against all the petitioners and also filed an execution in the said complaint. The respondent no.2 also filed a petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. The petitioner no.1 also filed a petition for divorce against the respondent no.2 which has already been dismissed for default. Subsequently, the parties compromised and resolved all their disputes.

4. Respondent No.2, present in the Court, submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved. As per the

mediation report, it has been agreed that petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 shall take divorce by way of mutual consent. It is also agreed that the petitioner no.1 shall pay a total sum of Rs. 4.5 lacs to respondent no.2 towards full and final settlement of all her claims qua istridhan, maintenance (past, present and future) and permanent alimony. It is agreed that the said amount shall be paid as enunciated in the said mediation report and that the said payment if made by way of DD, then the petitioner no.1 shall get the same prepared in the name of “Nidhi Kapoor”. It is also agreed that the respondent no.2 shall cooperate with the petitioner no.1 and his family members in quashing of the FIR in question. It is agreed that the parties shall withdraw their respective cases from the Courts concerned within 15 days from the recording of the statement of the parties in first motion for divorce. Respondent No.2 affirmed the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of her affidavit dated 02.04.2016 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.224/2012 dated 02.08.2012, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station New Ashok Nagar and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioners.

15. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

Crl.M.A. No. 7942/2016 (To reject the petition)

The present application has been filed by one Sh. Rajeev Sachdeva (applicant) to oppose the petition for quashing of the FIR No.224/2012 dated 02.08.2012, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station New Ashok Nagar on the ground of settlement with respondent no.2 and to also direct a detailed enquiry against the respondent no.2.

Undisputedly, the present applicant is neither a petitioner nor a respondent in the main quashing petition i.e. CRL.M.C. 1332/2016. The main petition was filed by the petitioners for quashing of the FIR in question against them on the basis of the compromise arrived at between them and respondent no.2. It is further undisputed that the present applicant is neither a party to the main petition nor he is a party to the settlement. The only ground taken by the applicant is that he is claiming himself to be a necessary party to prevent the respondent no.2 from entering into a settlement with the petitioners. Undisputedly, the petitioners and the respondent no.2 have entered

into a settlement and in such a scenario, the applicant has no locus to challenge the settlement between the parties.

Keeping in view, the abovesaid, the present application is hereby dismissed.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

MAY 19, 2016
dd

