

\$~6

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1972/2017

NEERAJ KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Pankaj Kumar, Advocate with
petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr.Kewal Singh Ahuja, APP for the
State/R-1 with SI Praveen, PS Jagat
Puri.
Respondent No.2 in person with
Counsel (Appearance not given).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

04.08.2017

1. The present petition has been filed by the petitioner under Section 482 CrPC for quashing of FIR No.387/2013, under Sections 354/354A/354B/354D/506/509 IPC, PS Jagat Puri, Delhi and consequential proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of settlement arrived at between the parties.

2. Briefly stating, the FIR in question has been registered on the basis of statement made by the complainant/respondent No.2 in respect of incident that took place on 26th August, 2013.

3. It is mentioned in the petition that cross FIR No.302/2014, under Sections 192/204/323/341/352/308/34 IPC, P.S. Jagat Puri, Delhi has also been got registered by the petitioner against the respondent No.2 and her

husband in respect of the same incident.

4. It is further mentioned in the petition that parties have arrived at an amicable settlement with the intervention of family members and neighbourers vide compromise deed dated 12th April, 2017 which has been placed on record as Annexure-B.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that parties have arrived at an amicable settlement out of their own sweet will, without any pressure and force from any corner. He further submits that connected petition i.e. CrI.M.C. No.1980/2017 seeking quashing of cross FIR No.302/2014, under Sections 192/204/323/341/352/308/34 IPC, P.S. Jagat Puri, Delhi wherein the complainant/respondent No.2 herein and her husband are accused persons, is also listed today at Serial No.8. He further submits that vide compromise deed dated 12th April, 2017 the parties have settled their dispute in respect of both the FIRs.

6. Learned counsel for the petitioner prays that after the matter in dispute has been amicably settled between the parties, no purpose would be served in prosecuting the petitioner, therefore the FIR in question and criminal proceedings emanating therefrom may be quashed.

7. Respondent No.2/complainant is present in person and affirms the factum of settlement. Respondent No.2/complainant further submits that she does not wish to pursue the criminal case against the petitioner any further, hence the FIR in question may be quashed qua the petitioner.

8. Though the petitioner has been chargesheeted for the offences, some of which are non-compoundable, but in the decision in the case of Gian Singh v State of Punjab & Anr. 2012 (9) SCALE 257, the three Judges Bench of the Supreme Court dealing with the issue of quashing of FIR has

laid down the following guidelines:-

“57. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences Under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz; (i) to secure the ends of justice or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any Court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or F.I.R may be exercised where the offender and victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity etc; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominantly civil favour stand on different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, High Court may quash criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal case would put accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme

injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. 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 proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and 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 affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

9. In view of the legal position as laid down in Gian Singh's case (supra) and the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties, I am of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by continuing the criminal proceedings against the petitioner which will only be an exercise in futile and wastage of precious time of the Court.

10. However, in the facts and circumstances of the case, it is desirable that the petitioner must be burdened with cost. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to deposit the cost of ₹25,000/- with Pragati Institute for Severally and Profoundly Mentally Retarded (ISPMR), Female Wing, Asha Kiran Complex, Sector-1, Rohini, Delhi-110085 within four weeks from the date of this order. The payment of cost should be made by cheque in favour of “H.O./D.O. for School & Home Mentally Retarded Children” in Account No.394501010013010. The said amount of ₹25,000/- shall be utilized to meet day to day urgent needs of the inmates.

11. The proof of depositing the cost shall be placed on record within one week thereafter.

12. The petition is allowed and FIR No.387/2013, under Sections
CRL.M.C. 1972/2017

354/354A/354B/354D/506/509 IPC, PS Jagat Puri, Delhi and all the proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

13. A copy of this order be sent to the Superintendent, Pragati Institute for Severally and Profoundly Mentally Retarded (ISPMR), Female Wing, Asha Kiran Complex, Sector-1, Rohini, Delhi-110085 for information and compliance.

Order *dasti*.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

AUGUST 04, 2017

'st'