

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4934/2015**

Date of Decision : February 05th, 2016

SAMEER SAXENA & ORS

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ranvir Singh, Advocate

versus

THE STATE & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State
Mr. K.K. Vaid, Advocate for
respondent No. 2.

**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, Sh. Sameer Saxena, Smt. Mala Saxena @ Mala Devi, Sh. Dinesh Manuja and Smt. Meenal Manuja for quashing of FIR No.412/2012 dated 24.12.2012, under Sections 498A/34 IPC & Section 4 Dowry Prohibition Act registered at Police Station Shahdara on the basis of the compromise deed between petitioner no.1 and respondent No.2, namely, Smt. Manpreet @ Manpreet Kaur

on 09.12.2014.

2. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submitted that the respondent No.2, present in the Court has been identified to be the complainant/first-informant of the FIR in question by her counsel.

3. The factual matrix of the present case is that the marriage between petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 was solemnized on 05.07.2009. After the marriage, petitioner no.1 kept respondent no.2 in a tenanted accommodation at 15/14 Krishna Nagar, Delhi. After about 1 year of the marriage respondent no.2's mother-in-law, sister-in-law and brother-in-law took the respondent no.2 to their home at Bhikam Singh Colony, Vishwas Nagar. A few days after moving into her matrimonial home, respondent no.2 experienced a change in attitude of her husband and her in-laws. A demand of Rs. 5 Lacs in cash was also made by the in-laws of respondent no.2, so that she could purchase a Tempo and upon refusal by the respondent no.2, she was administered several beatings by her husband in unison with his family members. On 27.07.2010, petitioner no.1 along with his mother, sister & brother-in-law beat respondent no.2 mercilessly after

consuming liquor. In April 2011, petitioner no.2, after consuming liquor pushed respondent no.2 down the stairs so as to terminate respondent no.2's pregnancy and then turned her out of the house. On 22.07.2011, respondent no.2 gave birth to a son, the expenses of which had to be borne by the parents of respondent no.2. After hearing the news of the childbirth, the husband and in-laws of respondent no.2 took her back to her matrimonial home following which the physical torture for dowry started again. Respondent no.2 was not supplied a proper diet and the in-laws started beating her daily. On 21.09.2011, the in-laws of the complainant again gave her beatings and her mother-in-law made her and her newly born child bit by a dog and threw her out of the house. On the same day, the husband of the complainant and her in-laws entered her parental home and started beating and abusing her and her parents. The husband of the complainant filed a divorce case at Karkadooma Court after leveling false allegations against her and asked to either bring Rs. 5 lacs from her father or else he shall enter into a second marriage.

The petitioner no.1 filed a divorce petition under Section 13(1) (i-a) & (i-b) H.M.A. against respondent no.2 at Karkadooma Courts

Delhi, which was subsequently dismissed as withdrawn. Respondent no.2 filed a complaint to the Police Commissioner, Delhi and CAW Cell, Delhi against the petitioners. On the basis of the said complaint the FIR in question was registered. After completion of the investigation in the FIR in question, the I.O. filed the charge sheet. Respondent no.2 filed a petition under Section 125 of Cr.P.C. and an application under Section 12 of the D.V. Act, which were later on withdrawn by her. During the course of the trial of the aforesaid cases and FIR in question, the parties arrived at an amicable settlement.

4. Respondent No.2, present in the Court, submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved. With the intervention of family members, common friends and well-wishers, the petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 decided to resolve all their disputes amicably and get their marriage dissolved by filing a petition for divorce by mutual consent before the concerned Court. As per the terms of the compromise deed, it has been agreed between the parties, i.e. namely petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2, that petitioner no.1 shall give a total sum of Rs. 2,50,000/- to respondent no.2 in five installments as full and final settlement amount to the towards her

dowry articles/stridhan, maintenance and permanent alimony for past, present and future for herself and their minor son. It is agreed that out of the total amount of settlement, Rs. 50,000/- shall be paid in cash to respondent no.2 in the petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C and Rs.50,000/- in cash to respondent no.2 at the time of withdrawal of the aforesaid complaint under Section 12 of the D.V. Act on its date fixed i.e. 09.12.2014. It is further agreed that a sum of Rs. 25,000/- each in cash shall be paid by petitioner no.1 to respondent no.2 at the time of recording of the joint statement in the divorce petition by way of mutual consent under Section 13-B(1) of H.M.A. and at the time of recording of the joint statement in the divorce petition by way of mutual consent under Section 13-B(2) of H.M.A. before the Court concerned and that the sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- shall be payable by the petitioner no.1 to the respondent no.2 at the time of quashing of the FIR in question before this Court. It is further agreed between the parties that petitioner no.1 shall approach this Court for quashing of the FIR in question within a period of 30 days after obtaining the decree of divorce. It is also agreed that none of the parties shall file any kind of cases or complaint against each other or their relatives

related to their aforesaid marriage in future. It is also agreed that the custody of the minor son namely master Ansh shall remain with respondent no.2 who will maintain him and petitioner no.1 shall never claim custody or visitation rights. It is agreed between the parties that respondent no.2 shall not have any right to claim maintenance etc. or any kind of right in property for herself or their minor son. Respondent No.2 affirms the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of her affidavit dated 21.11.2015 supporting this petition. In the affidavit, the respondent no.2 has stated that she has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed. All the disputes and differences have been resolved through mutual consent. Now no dispute with petitioners survives and so, the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be brought to an end. Statement of the respondent No.2 has been recorded in this regard in which she stated that she has entered into a compromise with the petitioners and has settled all the disputes with them. She further stated that she 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 respondent no.2 agrees to the quashing of the FIR in question without any threat or coercion or undue influence and has stated that the matter has been settled out of her own free will. 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 Section 498A IPC & Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act 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. *The Courts in India are now normally taking the view that endeavour should be taken to promote conciliation and secure speedy settlement of disputes relating to marriage and family affairs such as, matrimonial disputes between the couple or/and between the wife and her in-laws. India being a vast country naturally has large number of*

married persons resulting into high numbers of matrimonial disputes due to differences in temperament, life-styles, opinions, thoughts etc. between such couples, due to which majority is coming to the Court to get redressal. In its 59th report, the Law Commission of India had emphasized that while dealing with disputes concerning the family, the Court ought to adopt an approach radically different from that adopted in ordinary civil proceedings and that it should make reasonable efforts at settlement before the commencement of the trial. Further it is also the constitutional mandate for speedy disposal of such disputes and to grant quick justice to the litigants. But, our Courts are already over burdened due to pendency of large number of cases because of which it becomes difficult for speedy disposal of matrimonial disputes alone. As the matrimonial disputes are mainly between the husband and the wife and personal matters are involved in such disputes, so, it requires conciliatory procedure to bring a settlement between them. Nowadays, mediation has played a very important role in settling the disputes, especially, matrimonial disputes and has yielded good results. The Court must exercise its inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to put an end to the

matrimonial litigations at the earliest so that the parties can live peacefully.

12. Since the subject matter of this FIR is essentially matrimonial, which now stands mutually and amicably settled between the parties, therefore, continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility and is a fit case for this Court to exercise its inherent jurisdiction.

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

14. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and FIR No.412/2012 dated 24.12.2012, under Sections 498A/34 IPC & Section 4 Dowry Prohibition Act registered at Police Station Shahdara and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioners.

15. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 05, 2016
dd