

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 4735/2015

Date of Decision : January 22nd, 2016

VIKASH & ANR Petitioners
Through Mr.Manish Kumar, Adv. with
petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE & ANR Respondents
Through Ms.Manjeet Arya, APP for the State
with SI Kamlesh, PS Ambedkar
Nagar.
Ms.Pallavi Deepika, Adv. for R-
2/BSES.

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, Vikash and Ram Kumar for quashing of FIR No.270/2012 dated 27.08.2012, under Section 379 IPC and Section 135 of the Electricity Act, 2003 registered at Police Station Ambedkar Nagar on the basis of mediation report of the Delhi high Court Mediation & Conciliation Centre, New Delhi arrived at between the petitioners and respondent no.2, namely, BSES Rajdhani Power Limited through its authorized representative Ms. Jaya

Thakuria, Manager Legal, BSES Bhawan, Nehru Place, New Delhi on 02.12.2015.

2. Vide its order dated 23.11.2015, this Court had sent the matter to the Delhi high Court Mediation & Conciliation Centre on the request of the parties for a possible amicable settlement of all the disputes between them. The parties were directed to appear before the Delhi High Court Mediation & Conciliation Centre on 24.11.2015 at 3.00 p.m. On the next date of hearing i.e. 08.12.2015, it was reported that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and a mediation report was filed on record dated 02.12.2015. As per the mediation report, it has been agreed between the parties that the respondent no.2 has already received a sum of Rs. 21,400/- towards enforcement case ID No. RJ110612SA077 on account of full and final settlement of the dispute between the parties and the respondent no.2 has also issued no due certificate to the petitioners. It is further agreed that the respondent no.2 has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed. Now no dispute remains between the respondent no.2 and the petitioners and so, the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be brought to an end.

3. 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.”

4. 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.

5. 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. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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.

8. 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.

9. Apparently, in the present case, the dispute is regarding payment of electricity theft bill which ultimately led to registration of the FIR in question regarding the theft of electricity and electricity department i.e. the complainant is satisfied with the settlement dated 02.12.2015 on the deposit of Rs.21,400/- by the petitioners.

10. In the facts and circumstances of this case and in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, the FIR in question warrants to be put to an end and proceedings emanating thereupon need to be quashed.

11. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and FIR No.270/2012 dated 27.08.2012, under Section 379 IPC and Section 135 of the Electricity Act, 2003 registered at Police Station Ambedkar Nagar and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioners.

12. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

JANUARY 22, 2016
dd