

+ CRL.M.C. 4667/2015

SANJIT SHASTRI & ORS Petitioners
Through Mr.Satish Tamta, Adv.

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondents
Through Mr.Amit Chadha, APP for the State.
SI Vijay, PS Lajpat Nagar.
Mr.Puneet Kumar Gupta, Authorised
Representative of Respondent No.2 in
person.

P.S.TEJI, J.

1. The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed by the petitioners, namely, Sh. Sanjit Shastri, Sh. Vijay Gupta, Sh. Himanshu Thakkar and Sh. Ravinder Deshmukh for quashing the FIR No.665/1998 dated 11.08.1998, under Sections 406/420/467/468/471/34 IPC registered at Police Station Lajpat Nagar on the basis of the compromise arrived at in the Delhi High Court Mediation & Conciliation Centre, Delhi High Court, New Delhi between the petitioners and the respondent no.2, namely, M/s. FS Advertising Ltd., having its registered office at 14, Community Centre, East of

Kailash, New Delhi-110065 through its authorized representative Sh. Puneet Kumar Gupta on 12.10.2015.

2. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submitted that the Sh. Puneet Kumar Gupta, present in the Court has been identified to be the authorized representative of respondent no.2 in the FIR in question by his counsel.

3. The factual matrix of the present case is that the complainant lodged the FIR in question on the allegation that the petitioners were serving as Senior Vice President (Projects and New Media), Executive Vice President and General Manager (Advertising Sales) with M/s Time and Space Media Entertainment Promotion Ltd. T&S had regular business dealings with M/s F.S. Advertising. FSA appointed T&S as “Agency on record” for its various clients. On 30.04.1998, FSA filed a complaint before the Court of MM, New Delhi making allegations of criminal breach of trust, cheating, forgery etc. against the petitioners.

On the said complaint, an investigation was directed under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. by the ld. MM and accordingly FIR in question was registered. After the completion of the investigation, the

charge sheet was filed by the IO on 09.03.1999. Before filing the charge sheet, the accused Abbi Karun was declared a P.O. and during trial the main accused Manu S Kamaran was also declared P.O. Later on, the parties were referred to mediation, where they settled all their disputes amicably.

4. Sh. Puneet Kumar Gupta, authorized representative of respondent No.2, present in the Court submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved. As per the compromise, it is agreed that respondent no.2 has received an amount of Rs. 2 Lacs by way of 5 Demand Drafts. It is also agreed that the balance amount of Rs. 3 Lacs will be paid to respondent no.2 at the time of recording of statement of the respondent no.2, through Sh. Puneet Kumar Gupta in support of the quashing petition. It is also agreed that respondent no.2 has executed an affidavit to be filed in support of the said quashing proceedings and handed over the same to the petitioners. It is also agreed that the said petition shall be filed by the advocates for the petitioners before this Court within four weeks from the date of the compromise. It is also agreed that the parties shall appear before this Court when the said petition comes up for hearing

to make the requisite statement for quashing of the said proceedings. It is also agreed that respondent no.2 shall do all appropriate acts, deeds and things which are required to be done for the quashing of the said proceedings. It is further agreed that neither party shall make any claim or demand or initiate any proceeding with respect to the dispute which is the subject matter of the FIR qua the petitioners on any ground whatsoever. It is also agreed that however, in the event of this Court not quashing the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question, the amount of Rs. 2 Lacs paid by the petitioners will be refunded by the respondent no.2 and the respondent no.2 shall be at liberty to proceed against the petitioners. Sh. Puneet Kumar Gupta (Account Manager) of respondent no.2 affirmed the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of his affidavit dated 03.11.2015 supporting this petition. As per the affidavit filed by Sh. Puneet Kumar Gupta on behalf of the respondent no.2, it has been stated that all disputes with the petitioner have been settled and that there exists no objection if the FIR in question is quashed. All the disputes and differences have been resolved through mutual consent. Now no dispute with petitioner survives and so, the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be

brought to an end. Statement of Sh. Puneet Kumar Gupta, Account Manager of the respondent No.2 has been recorded in this regard in which he stated that respondent no.2 has entered into a compromise with the petitioner and has settled all the disputes with him. He further stated that respondent no.2 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 Sh. Puneet Kumar Gupta, the authorized representative of respondent no.2 agreed to the quashing of the FIR in question and has stated that the matter has been settled out of the free will of respondent no.2. 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 offences under Sections 467/468/471 IPC are non-compoundable offences, there should be no impediment in quashing the FIR under these sections, if the Court is otherwise satisfied that the facts and circumstances of the case so warrant.

11. In the facts and circumstances of this case and in view of statement made by the respondent No.2, the FIR in question warrants to be put to an end and proceedings emanating thereupon need to be quashed.

12. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and the FIR No.665/1998 dated 11.08.1998, under Sections 406/420/467/468/471/34 IPC registered at Police Station Lajpat Nagar and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioners.

13. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

MARCH 02, 2016
dd