

\$~50

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CRL.M.C. 1975/2016

KARAN SINGH & ORS.

..... Petitioner

Through

Mr. Shyam Kumar, Advocate along with
petitioners in person

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

..... Respondent

Through

Mr. Akshai Malik, APP along with SI Puneet
Grewal, PS Swaroop Nagar.
Mr. Vipin Chandra, Advocate for R-2 along
with respondent No. 2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SUNITA GUPTA

ORDER

%

20.05.2016

Crl.M.A.No.8364/2016 (exemption)

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

Crl.M.C.1975/2016 & Crl.M.A.8365/2016(stay)

1. This is a petition under S. 482 Cr.PC moved by the petitioners for quashing of FIR No.228/2013 registered at Police Station Swaroop Nagar under Ss 406/498A/34 IPC and consequent proceedings emanating therefrom on the ground that the parties have compromised the matter.
2. It is submitted by counsel for the petitioners that basically it is a matrimonial dispute. Petitioner No.1 is the husband of respondent No.2. Petitioner Nos. 2 & 3 are the brother-in-law of respondent No.2 and petitioner Nos. 4 & 5 are the mother-in-law and father-in-law of respondent No.2 respectively. The marriage between petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 was solemnized according to Hindu rites and ceremonies on 20.06.2011. A son was born on 27.06.2012 from the wedlock but the said child had died on 02.07.2012. Due to temperamental differences, petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 started

living separately from each other w.e.f. 29.03.2013. Respondent No.2 lodged a complaint against the petitioners before the CAW Cell, Pitam Pura, Delhi and consequently upon that, present FIR has been registered. The matter has been amicably settled between the parties before the Mediation Cell, Rohini Court, Delhi vide settlement deed dated 19.12.2013 (which is annexed to the petition at pgs. 101-102). As per the settlement, petitioner No. 1 has agreed to pay a total sum of Rs.2,10,000/- to respondent No. 2 in four instalments towards all her claims in respect to dowry/Istridhan articles, maintenance as well as permanent alimony. The petitioner no.1 has already paid a sum of Rs.20,000/- to respondent No. 2 at the time of granting bail and the second instalment of Rs.70,000/- has been received by respondent No.2 at the time of first motion before the Family Court on 07.07.2014. The third instalment of Rs.70,000/- has also been received by respondent No.2 from petitioner No.1 at the time of second motion on 19.05.2015. The marriage between the parties has already been dissolved by way of mutual consent vide order dated 20.05.2015 by the Family Court, North Rohini, Delhi.

3. In total, the petitioner no.1 has already paid a sum of Rs.1,60,000/- to respondent no.2 and the balance amount of Rs.50,000/- has been paid today to the respondent no.2 by the petitioner by way of cheque No.505261 drawn on United Bank of India, Nand Nagri Branch dated 19.05.2016. It is, therefore, prayed that the instant FIR be quashed.

4. 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.2,10,000/- from the petitioner. As such, it is submitted by her that she does not want any action against the petitioners and has no objection to quashing the instant FIR.

5. Mr Akshai Malik, Additional 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.

6. 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.”

7. 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.

8. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.228/2013 registered at PS Swaroop Nagar under Ss 406/498A/34 IPC and consequent proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

The petition stands disposed of accordingly.

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

SUNITA GUPTA, J

MAY 20, 2016

rs