

\$~13

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3048/2015**

MANMEET SINGH MATHAROO & ORS Petitioners

Through: Mr.Hasan Anzar, Mr.Osama Suhail,
Advocates with petitioners No.2 and
3 in person.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, A.S.C. for the
State/R-1.
Respondent No.2/complainant in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

19.01.2016

Crl.M.A. No.18719/2015

1. For the reasons stated in the application, 25 days' delay in re-filing the petition is condoned.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 3048/2015

1. The present writ petition has been filed by the Petitioners under Article 226 of Constitution of India read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.327/2014, under Sections 498-A/406/34 IPC, P.S. Pandav Nagar, Delhi, on the basis of settlement arrived at between the parties.
2. Today petitioner No.2 and 3, who are father-in-law and mother-in-law of respondent No.2/complainant are present in person with their counsel.

W.P.(CRL) 3048/2015

Page 1 of 4

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner No.1, who is husband of respondent No.2/complainant is residing in USA and he has executed a Special Power of Attorney in favour of his father Sh.Harvail Singh/petitioner No.2 to act on his behalf. Copy of the Special Power of Attorney is annexed with the petition as Annexure-P6.

3. Briefly stating the facts of the present case are that Respondent No.2 got married to Petitioner No.1 on 12.02.2011 according to Sikh rites and ceremonies. It is mentioned in the petition that due to certain misunderstanding, the petitioner No.1 and Respondent No.2 could not live together and started living separately. Thereafter, apart from filing a divorce petition under Section 13(1)(ia) of Hindu Marriage Act, the respondent No.2 also filed a criminal complaint which resulted into registration of FIR in question against the petitioners.

4. It is further mentioned in the petition that during the pendency of the above proceedings, the parties arrived at an amicable settlement and agreed to dissolve the marriage by decree of divorce by mutual consent.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners and respondent No.2 have amicably resolved their dispute and respondent No.2 is not left with any claim or grievance of any nature against the petitioners. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that since the parties have settled their disputes amicably and the marriage between the petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 also stands dissolved by a decree of divorce by mutual consent, no useful purpose would be served by continuance of criminal proceedings against the petitioners, hence the FIR in question be quashed.

6. Respondent No.2, who is present in the Court today, confirms the

factum of amicable settlement with the petitioners. Respondent No.2 submits that she has no grievance whatsoever left against the petitioners and has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed qua the petitioners.

7. The FIR registered against the present Petitioners is for committing the offences punishable under Sections 498-A/406/34 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 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.”

8. In view of the legal position laid down in *Gian Singh's case* (Supra) and amicable settlement arrived at between the parties, I am of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by continuing the criminal proceedings against the petitioners, which will only be an exercise in futile and wastage of precious time of the Court.

9. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and FIR No.327/2014, under Sections 498-A/406/34 IPC, P.S.Pandav Nagar, Delhi and consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

Order dasti.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

JANUARY 19, 2016

‘da’