

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4973/2015**

Date of Decision : February 05th, 2016

RAJEEV JINDAL @ RAJIV KUMAR ZINDAL Petitioner
Through **Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv.**

versus

STATE & ORS Respondents
Through **Mr. Arun Kr. Sharma, APP for State**
Mr. Charan Singh, 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. Rajeev Jindal @ Rajiv Kumar Zindal for quashing of FIR No.18/2004 dated 22.01.2004, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station M.S. Park on the basis of the mediation report of the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkadooma Courts, Delhi arrived at between the petitioner and respondent No.2, namely, Smt. Sarita Rani on 02.09.2013.

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 SI Jagdish Prasad.

3. The factual matrix of the present case is that the marriage between petitioner and respondent no.2 was solemnized on 24.01.2003 according to Hindu rites and ceremonies. The complainant/respondent no.2 reached her matrimonial home on 25.01.2003 when the mother-in-law of the complainant started taunting her by saying that they joined relationship with beggars. The husband of the complainant also said that he was planning to run away from the marriage. After that the mother-in-law of the complainant scratched the face of the complainant and her husband held her hair tightly and continuously slapped her on the face. When next day the brother of the complainant came to meet the complainant, the husband and the mother-in-law insulted him badly. After that the complainant was beaten up by her husband and her mother-in-law on regular basis. The husband of the complainant is a habitual drinker and used to say to the complainant that he already has a criminal case of murder against him. The friend of the mother-in-law of the complainant was also involved in instigating and beating

the complainant with her husband and mother-in-law. On 07.02.2003, when the parents of the complainant came to visit her, the husband of the complainant slapped her father and her mother-in-law started abusing her father. The father of the complainant made several complaints on which the husband of the complainant on 12.03.2003 came to her parental home and beat the father of the complainant. On 13.03.2003, after attending the proceedings of CAW Cell, when the complainant was returning home, her husband took her and she was beaten up very badly. The mother-in-law of the complainant even tried to put the complainant on fire.

The respondent no.2 had filed maintenance petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. and a written complaint to the CAW Cell, Delhi against the petitioner and his family members. On the basis of the said complaint, the FIR in question was registered. During the trial of the case, 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. As per the said report, it has been agreed between the parties that they shall take divorce by way of mutual consent. It is further agreed that petitioner

shall pay a total sum of Rs. 1,50,000/- to respondent no. 2 towards full and final settlement of all her claims arising out of their marriage which includes maintenance (past, present and future), permanent alimony, dowry articles, jewellery, stridhan etc. It has been further agreed between the parties that Rs. 50,000/- shall be payable by the petitioner to the respondent no.2 at the time of recording of the statements of the parties in the first motion petition, which shall be filed within September 2013. It is further agreed that Rs. 50,000/- shall be paid, by the petitioner to respondent no.2, at the time of recording of the statements of the parties in the second motion which shall be filed after the expiry of statutory period of six months. It has further been agreed that the balance amount of Rs. 50,000/- shall be paid to the respondent no.2 by the petitioner before this Court at the time of quashing of the FIR in question. It is also agreed that the quashing petition shall be filed within one month after passing of decree of divorce by way of mutual consent. It is further agreed that respondent no.2 shall withdraw all her pending execution petitions within 15 days after recording of statements of the parties in first motion. It has been agreed that apart from the cases mentioned above,

they have not filed any other case/complaint/legal proceedings against each other and that in case any such case/complaint/legal proceedings is found pending between them arising out of their marriage, the same shall be withdrawn by the concerned party in terms of this settlement. Respondent No.2 affirms the contents of the aforesaid settlement and of her affidavit dated 01.10.2015 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 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 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 is a non-compoundable offence, there should be no impediment in quashing the FIR under this section, 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.18/2004 dated 22.01.2004, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station M.S. Park and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioner.

15. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 05, 2016
dd