

\$~40
* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI
+ CRL.M.C. 1927/2016
MANOJ RAJ & ORS

..... Petitioner
Through Mr Shalabh Gupta, Adv. alongwith petitioners
in person

versus
NATIONAL CAPITAL TERRITORY OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondent
Through Mr Arun Kumar Sharma, Addl. Public
Prosecutor for the State alongwith Sub Inspector
B. Kumar Police Station North Rohini, Delhi
Mr Davinder Hora and Mr Sikandar Khan, advs.
for R2 alongwith R2 in person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SUNITA GUPTA

ORDER
18.05.2016

%
Crl. MA 8194/2016 (exemption)

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

Crl. MC 1927/2016 & Crl. MA 8193/2016 (stay)

This is a petition under S. 482 Cr.PC moved by the petitioners for quashing of FIR No.31/2014 registered at Police Station North Rohini, New Delhi under Ss 406/498A/34 IPC and consequent proceedings emanating therefrom on the ground that the parties have compromised the matter.

It is submitted by counsel for the petitioners that basically it is a matrimonial dispute. The marriage between the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 was solemnized according to Hindu rites and ceremonies on 27.04.2009. Due to temperamental differences, the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 could not pull together and consequently the instant FIR was got registered at the behest of the respondent no.2. With the benign intervention of the family and friends, the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 arrived at a settlement and a compromise deed dated 13.10.2015 was executed between the parties, which is annexed to the petition at pgs. 82 – 88. It has been agreed between the parties that the petitioner no.1 will pay Rs.9 lacs to the respondent no.2 towards full and final settlement of all her claims towards maintenance, permanent alimony, istridhan, etc. In pursuance of the aforesaid compromise, the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 have moved the first motion for mutual divorce and the same was allowed by the Court of Ms Bimla Kumari, Judge, Family Court, North West, Rohini Court,

Delhi vide order dated 29.10.2015 and the petitioner no.1 has paid a sum of Rs.2 lacs to the respondent no.2 at the time of recording of her statement in the first motion petition. The respondent no.2 has received a further sum of Rs.3 lac from the petitioner no.1 and she has withdrawn three cases from Family Courts, Rohini, Delhi filed by her. The statement of the respondent no.2 and petitioner no.1 was recorded in the second motion and the petitioner no.1 had paid an amount of Rs.2 lacs to the respondent no.2 and the balance amount of Rs.2 lac has been paid to the respondent no.2 in the Court today by way of demand draft, copy of which has been placed on record. It is therefore prayed that the instant FIR be quashed.

The respondent No.2/complainant, who is present in person (duly identified by the Investigating Officer of the case as well as her counsel) submits that she has amicably resolved all disputes with the petitioners voluntarily without there being any threat, coercion or pressure of any sort. She further submits that she has received the total settlement amount of Rs.9 lacs from the petitioner. As such, it is submitted by her that she does not want any action against the petitioner and has no objection to quashing the instant FIR.

Mr Arun Kumar Sharma, Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State submits that in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, he has no objection to quashing of FIR, however, since the State machinery has been set in motion on account of the acts of the petitioners, they be burdened with costs.

Needless to say, offences with which the petitioners are booked are non-compoundable. However in the case of *Gian Singh v State of Punjab & Anr. 2012 (9) Scale 257*, the three Judges Bench of the Supreme Court dealt with the issue of quashing of FIR in non compoundable offences. Para 57 of the report is extracted hereunder:-

“57. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be 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 flavour 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.”

In view of the same, since it is a matrimonial dispute which the parties have amicably resolved, continuation of the criminal proceedings would be a futile exercise and it will be rather in the ends of justice to give quietus to such litigation.

Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.31/2014 registered at Police Station North Rohini, New Delhi under Ss 406/498A/34 IPC and consequent proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

Pending application also stands disposed of.

A copy of this order be given *dasti* to counsel for the petitioners.

SUNITA GUPTA, J

MAY 18, 2016/*rd*