

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ CRL.M.C. 1044/2017

Date of Hearing & Order: March 23rd, 2017

PRAKASH SAINI & ORS

..... Petitioner

Through Mr.Anil Garg, Adv. with petitioners in person.

versus

STATE & ANR

..... Respondent

Through Mr.M.S. Oberoi, APP with SI Sareen Kharb, PS Dwarka South.

Respondent no.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.S.TEJI

P.S.TEJI, J.(Oral)

1. The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed by the petitioners, namely, Sh. Parkash Saini and others for quashing of FIR No.570/2014, under Section 498A/406/506/354D/34 IPC registered at Police Station South Dwarka, Delhi on the basis of an amicable settlement between the petitioners and respondent No. 2 namely, Smt. Shilpa Saini.
2. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submitted that the respondent present in the Court has been identified to be the complainant in the criminal complaint in question.
3. The factual matrix of the present case is that the complainant in

the present matter (Respondent No.2) got married to the accused/petitioner on 22.05.2013 as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. The complainant's family got to know about the accused/petitioner and his family through a matrimonial site, and upon talking with them, they stressed on giving a car on the occasion of marriage, specifying on a "big car", namely "Toyota Fortuner". Prior to the marriage, the accused used to consistently talk with the complainant and would also inquire about the nature of preparations towards the marriage, with specific focus on whether the said car was booked or not. When the complainant informed the accused that the said car was outside the budget of her parents, the accused cut the phone call and turned sour. After the marriage also, the complainant/respondent No.2 has been subjected to constant taunts, humiliation and physical assault on account of non fulfillment of the demand of a car. The accused also indulged in unnatural sexual intercourse with the complainant on several occasions despite her resistance. The complainant/Respondent No.2 also found out about an illicit extra marital affair of the accused and when she questioned the same she was asked to keep quiet and bear with the said fact. On 17/10/2013, the accused after coming back from work started beating the complainant without any reason and threw her out of the house stating that she should be back only when her father gave them a "big car". Despite efforts by the complainant's family to settle matter amicably, the accused and his family did not agree and continued with harassment. The co-accused in the present matter harassed the complainant frequently while she went to work. The accused also used to harass her by sending vulgar messages on

her mobile and also to her family members.

The complainant after the above series of events got registered the complaint in the present matter.

4. Respondent No.2 present in the Court submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved with the accused/petitioners. Respondent affirmed the contents of the aforesaid settlement. 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 criminal complaint in question may be brought to an end. Statement of the respondent has been recorded in this regard in which she stated that she has entered into a compromise deed with the petitioners and has settled all the disputes with him. She further stated that she has no objection if the criminal complaint 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 agreed to the quashing of the criminal complaint in question and 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 a 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 tranquility 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/Criminal complaint 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 offence under Section 354D is a non-compoundable offence, there should be no impediment in quashing the FIR/Criminal complaint under this section, 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, the Criminal Complaint 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.570/2014, under Section 498A/406/506/354D/34 IPC registered at Police Station Dwarka South, Dwarka, New Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed against the petitioners.

13. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(P.S.TEJI)
JUDGE

MARCH 23rd, 2017
dd