

\$~48

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1558/2017**

RAJESH GARG Petitioner
Through: **Mr.Paramjeet Dabas, Adv.**

versus

STATE & ORS Respondents
Through: **Mr.Karanjeet Kumar, Adv. for R-2 & 3.**
Mr.N.K.Aggarwal, Adv. for R-4 to 6.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR

ORDER
% **10.07.2017**

Crl.M.A. 8695/2017

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 1558/2017

The petitioner has sought quashing of the order dated 24.09.2014 passed by the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, East, District Courts, Karkardooma in CC No.215/2012 (Ranveer Singh vs. Rajesh Garg & Ors.) whereby the petitioners have been summoned under Sections 308/324/452/506/120B and 34 of the IPC.

At the instance of the brother of the petitioner, FIR No.181/2012 (P.S.Shakurpur) was registered against respondent No.3 Satish Yadav. As a counterblast, respondent No.3 also filed a complaint in collusion with respondent No.2 against the petitioner with respect to an incident dated

09.03.2012. In the aforesaid case, final report was submitted whereupon respondent No.3 was summoned to face trial.

Respondent Nos.2 & 3 were examined as CW 1 & 2 whereupon, by the order impugned cognizance was taken against the petitioner.

In the meantime, the parties entered into a Memorandum of Understanding whereby it was resolved that all the disputes would be settled. On the basis of the Memorandum of Understanding, the FIR No.181/2012 was quashed by the Court.

By virtue of the aforesaid Memorandum of Understanding, the civil suit between the parties was also disposed of.

The parties are present in Court, all of whom admit of the dispute having been settled.

It appears that the present complaint arose out of a property dispute for which a civil suit also had been filed at the behest of the respondents.

In ***State of Karnataka vs. L.Muniswamy & Ors, (1977) 2 SCC 699***, the Supreme Court has clearly observed that the saving of the High Court's inherent powers, both in civil and criminal matters, is designed to achieve a salutary public purpose namely that a Court proceeding ought not to be permitted to degenerate into a weapon of harassment and persecution. No useful purpose would actually be served in allowing the proceedings in the present complaint to be continued. It would only be expedient in the interest of justice to quash the present proceedings.

In ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Another, (2012) 10 SCC 303***, the Supreme Court has held that cases which are not compoundable under Section 320 of the Cr.P.C. could also be quashed, when continuation of any criminal proceeding would be an exercise in futility and where justice

demands that the dispute between the parties should be put to an end and peace is restored. But ending of such criminal proceedings could only be ordered for securing the ends of justice.

The Supreme Court has further observed in *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Another* (Supra):

“58..... No doubt, crimes are acts which have harmful effect on the public and consist in wrongdoing that seriously endangers and threatens the well-being of the society and it is not safe to leave the crime-doer only because he and the victim have settled the dispute amicably or that the victim has been paid compensation, yet certain crimes have been made compoundable in law, with or without the permission of the court. In respect of serious offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc., or other offences of mental depravity under IPC or offences of moral turpitude under special statutes, like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, the settlement between the offender and the victim can have no legal sanction at all. However, certain offences which overwhelmingly and predominantly bear civil flavour having arisen out of civil, mercantile, commercial, financial, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony, particularly relating to dowry, etc. or the family dispute, where the wrong is basically to the victim and the offender and the victim have settled all disputes between them amicably, irrespective of the fact that such offences have not been made compoundable, the High Court may within the framework of its inherent power, quash the criminal proceeding or criminal complaint or FIR if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing the criminal proceedings, justice shall be casualty and ends of justice shall be defeated. The above list is illustrative and not

exhaustive. Each case will depend on its own facts and no hard-and-fast category can be prescribed.”

[Refer to B.S. Joshi, (2003) 4 SCC 675; Nikhil Merchant, (2008) 9 SCC 677 and Manoj Sharma, (2008) 16 SCC 1.]

In *Narinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab & Anr.* 2014 6 SCC

466. The pertinent observations of the Apex Court 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:

(iii) ends of justice, or

(iv) 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.*

29.5. *While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.*

29.6. *Offences under Section 307 IPC would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore are to be generally treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of Section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of Section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to proving the charge under Section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delegate parts of the body, nature of weapons used, etc. Medical report in respect of injuries suffered by the victim can generally be the guiding factor. On the basis of this prima facie analysis, the High Court can examine as to whether there is a strong possibility of conviction or the chances of conviction are remote and bleak. In the former case it can refuse to accept the settlement and quash the criminal proceedings whereas in the latter case it would be permissible for the High Court to accept the plea*

compounding the offence based on complete settlement between the parties. At this stage, the Court can also be swayed by the fact that the settlement between the parties is going to result in harmony between them which may improve their future relationship.

29.7. While deciding whether to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Code or not, timings of settlement play a crucial role. Those cases where the settlement is arrived at immediately after the alleged commission of offence and the matter is still under investigation, the High Court may be liberal in accepting the settlement to quash the criminal proceedings/investigation. It is because of the reason that at this stage the investigation is still on and even the charge-sheet has not been filed. Likewise, those cases where the charge is framed but the evidence is yet to start or the evidence is still at infancy stage, the High Court can show benevolence in exercising its powers favourably, but after prima facie assessment of the circumstances/material mentioned above. On the other hand, where the prosecution evidence is almost complete or after the conclusion of the evidence the matter is at the stage of argument, normally the High Court should refrain from exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code, as in such cases the trial court would be in a position to decide the case finally on merits and to come to a conclusion as to whether the offence under Section 307 IPC is committed or not. Similarly, in those cases where the conviction is already recorded by the trial court and the matter is at the appellate stage before the High Court, mere compromise between the parties would not be a ground to accept the same resulting in acquittal of the offender who has already been convicted by the trial court. Here charge is proved under Section 307 IPC and conviction is already recorded of a heinous crime and, therefore, there is no question of sparing a convict found guilty of such a crime.”

Taking into account the aforesaid facts, the order of summoning dated 24.09.2014 in CC No.215/2012 (Ranveer Singh vs. Rajesh Garg & Ors) is

set aside. Resultantly, the entire criminal prosecution arising out of complaint case No.215/2012 is also set aside.

The writ petition stands allowed.

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J

JULY 10, 2017

k