

\$~10

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3802/2017

MANISH SINGHAL @ MANISH JINDGAR & ORS Petitioners

Through: Mr.Dalip Anand, Advocate with
petitioners in person

versus

THE STATE & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State with Inspector Asha CWC
Nanak Pura
Mr.Jayant Pawar, Advocate for the
complainant/R-2 with R-2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE PRATIBHA RANI

ORDER

%

15.09.2017

CRL.M.A.15372/2017

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 3802/2017

1. The present petition has been filed by the Petitioners under Section 482 Cr.P.C. read with Article 226 of Constitution of India for quashing of FIR No.58/2015, under Sections 498-A/406/509/34 IPC registered at P.S. CAW Cell, Delhi and proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioners.

2. Briefly stating the facts of the present case are that Respondent No.2

was got married to Petitioner No.1 on 14th November, 2013 at Hotel Valentine Resort situated at G.T.Karnal Road, Delhi according to Hindu rites and ceremonies. It is further mentioned in the petition that due to temperamental and other differences, the Petitioner No.1 and Respondent No.2 could not live together. They started living separately since 20th June, 2014. On 3rd June, 2015, Respondent No.2 filed a complaint to the CAW Cell, Nanakpura, New Delhi against the Petitioners, on the basis of which FIR in question was registered. It is mentioned in the petition that apart from the aforesaid complaint, various other litigations i.e. Petition under Section 9 of HMA, petition under Section 125 Cr.P.C. and application under Section 12 of D.V. Act were also filed by the parties.

3. During the pendency of above cases, with the intervention of family members, relatives and close friends, both the parties arrived at an amicable settlement and the MOU dated 17th December, 2016 incorporating the terms and conditions was executed between them. The copy of the said MOU dated 17th December, 2016 has been placed on record as Annexure-P3. The marriage between the petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 has been dissolved by mutual consent vide order dated 14th July, 2017 passed by the Principal Judge, Family Court (North), Rohini Courts, Delhi. The copy of the decree sheet dated 14th July, 2017 has been annexed with the petition as Annexure P-4.

4. In terms of full and final settlement arrived at between the parties, today learned counsel for the Petitioners has handed over to Respondent No.2 a demand draft for a sum of ₹ 3,00,000/-.

5. Respondent No.2 is present in person and submits that she has settled the matter with the Petitioners and in terms of said settlement, today she has

received a Demand Draft for a sum of ₹ 3,00,000/- from the Petitioners. Respondent No.2 further submits that she has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed qua the Petitioners.

6. The FIR registered against the present Petitioners is for committing the offences punishable under Sections 498-A/406/509/34 IPC. Offence punishable under Section 498-A IPC is a non-compoundable offence. 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 observed as under:-

“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.”

7. In view of the legal position laid down in *Gian Singh’s case* (Supra) and 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 petitioners, which will only be an exercise in futile and wastage of precious time of the Court.

8. Accordingly, in terms of the settlement case FIR No.58/2015, under Sections 498-A/406/509/34 IPC registered at P.S. CAW Cell, Delhi and consequential proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

Order dasti, as prayed.

PRATIBHA RANI, J.

SEPTEMBER 15, 2017

‘pg’