

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4782/2015**

Date of Decision: May 05th, 2016

MANOJ KUMAR

... Petitioner

Through **Ms. Sunita Sharma, Adv.**

versus

STATE & ANR.

... Respondent

Through **Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP.**

Mr. A.K. Sharma, Adv. for R-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 petitioner, namely, Sh. Manoj Kumar for quashing of FIR No.212/2011 dated 06.06.2011, under Sections 420/406/467/468/471/506 IPC registered at Police Station Seemapuri on the basis of the settlement agreement executed at Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre, Delhi High Court in view of the settlement arrived at between petitioner and respondent no.2, namely, Ms. Nirmala Devi along with others on 28.09.2015.

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 in the FIR in question by her counsel.

3. The factual matrix of the present case is that the FIR in question

was lodged by the complainant on the allegation that on 10.04.2003, the accused came to the complainant and asked her to visit S.R. office, Seelampur to get registered the title documents of the flat No. A-130/2-B, first floor, Dilshad extn-I, Delhi. The accused then handed her some documents relating to the said flat and obtained her signatures on those alleged documents. The complainant being illiterate could not understand the contents of the alleged documents. The complainant handed over a sale consideration of Rs. 2.6 lacs to the accused. Then, the accused suggested to the complainant to let out the said flat. The accused even told her about a person who was ready to pay Rs. 800 pm as rent. The complainant thus gave her flat on rent. The complainant used to collect the rent of the said flat but then she became ill and could not visit to collect the rent. Thereafter, the accused stopped paying rent to her. In the month of January 2011, when the rent became due to about 10-12 months, the complainant contacted the accused who informed her that she is not the owner of the said flat. The complainant even showed him the documents on which he informed her that they are forged. The complainant then visited her flat where a person was residing and he informed her that he has been paying rent to one Mr. Bharti.

After registration of the FIR in question, the petitioner was arrested and he remained in jail for 6 months. Thereafter, the petitioner was granted bail in the matter and challan was filed against him. The petitioner also filed a civil suit veering No. C.S. (O.S.) No. 2298/2014 against the respondent no.2 and others. Thereafter, during the said civil suit matter, both the parties arrived at an amicable

settlement with each other.

4. Respondent No.2 present in the Court submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved. As per the settlement, it is agreed that property bearing no. I-27, Gali No. 10, Brahmpuri, Delhi-110053 admeasuring 100 sq. yards shall be divided into two parts of 50 sq. yards each. It is also agreed that the one part of the aforesaid property measuring 50 sq. yards which is situated on the left side of the above said property shall be transferred in the name of the petitioner. It is also agreed that respondent no.2 shall keep the other part of the aforesaid property measuring 50 sq. yards situated on the right side of the above said property with her during lifetime with this understanding that she shall execute a gift deed in favour of LRs of her deceased brother namely Sh. Rakesh after 60 days from the date of this settlement agreement. It is also agreed that in case the gift deed is not executed by respondent no.2 for any reasons in favour of LRs of respondent no.2's deceased brother, then respondent no.2 shall not disturb, in future, the possession qua the portion of the aforesaid property which is presently with the LRs of her deceased brother. It is also agreed that the LRs of late Sh. Rakesh have undertaken that they shall take care of respondent no.2 throughout her life and they shall claim their ownership qua the portion of the property qua the portion of the property which is being kept with respondent no.2 at this stage only after her death. It is also agreed that respondent no.2 has agreed to withdraw all the cases filed by her against the petitioner and his wife pending in the Karkadooma Courts and give no objection to the quashing of the FIR in question. It is also agreed that the petitioner

shall withdraw the case filed by him or his wife to restore the cordial relation among the sisters and relatives unconditionally. Respondent no. 2 affirmed the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of her affidavit dated 19.11.2015 supporting this petition. In the affidavit, she 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 petitioner 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 petitioner and has settled all the disputes with him. 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 agreed to the quashing of the FIR in question 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 that 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 FIR No.212/2011 dated 06.06.2011, under Sections 420/406/467/468/471/506 IPC registered at Police Station Seemapuri and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioner.

13. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

MAY 05, 2016
dd