

\$~24

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2114/2017

SACHIN BAHRI & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through

Petitioners in person with Ms. Sahil
Munjal and Ms. Rhea Gandhi, Advs.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR

..... Respondents

Through

Mr. Hirein Shrama, Addl. PP for State
with SI Yadram Yadav, PS Janakpuri.
Respondent no.2 in person with
Mr. S.C. Kalra, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A. K. CHAWLA

ORDER

%

23.05.2017

CRL. M.A. 8696/2017 (exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

CRL. M.C. 2114/2017 (quashing)

By the instant petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C., petitioners seek quashing of FIR no. 39/2016 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, PS Janak Puri. IO identifies the parties present before the Court.

Subject FIR is the outcome of a matrimonial dispute and the parties have arrived at a compromise/settlement inter alia for quashing of the subject FIR. Today, before Court, a Demand Draft,

drawn on Andhra Bank favouring the complainant-respondent no.2 in the sum of ₹15 Lacs has been handed over to the complainant-respondent no.2. The complainant-respondent no.2 present before the Court states that with the receipt of the payment of ₹15 Lacs today before the Court, she is left with no other claim of any kind whatsoever against the petitioners. It is also jointly stated that all the actions/counter actions amongst the parties stand withdrawn. Dispute, of course, is of a private nature. Charge sheet has not yet been filed. Assuming, the charge sheet comes to be filed and the petitioners are subjected to trial of an offence under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, I do not consider, it would bear any fruit and the entire exercise may be futile. In Criminal Appeal No. 686/2014 titled **Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.**, decided on 27th March, 2014, Hon'ble Supreme Court set down the principles for exercise of power under Section 482 Cr.P.C., in the following words :

“31. 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:

(I) 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.

(II)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.

(III) Such a power is not 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 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.

(IV) On the other, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominantly 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.

(V) 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.

.....
.....”

Keeping in view the ratio of the judgment (supra) and totality of the facts and circumstances, I am of the considered view that ends of justice would be met with, if, the subject FIR no.39/2016 under

Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, PS Janak Puri, is quashed alongwith the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom. It is ordered accordingly. Petition stands disposed off.

CRL. M.A. 8697/2017 (stay)

Dismissed as infructuous.

A. K. CHAWLA, J

MAY 23, 2017/rc