

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

CRMP No. 1850 of 2017

1. Neeraj Shrivastava S/o Shri Prakesh Chandra Shrivastava
Aged About 32 Years R/o Gulmohar Park, Ramnagar, Raipur
Dist. Raipur Chhattisgarh, Chhattisgarh
2. Prakash Chandra Shrivastava S/o Late Shri Pyarelal
Shrivastva Aged About 68 Years R/o Gulmohar Park,
Ramnagar, Raipur Dist. Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur,
Chhattisgarh
3. Jai Shree Shrivastava W/o Shri Prakash Chandra Shrivastava
Aged About 58 Years R/o Gulmohar Park, Ramnagar, Raipur
Dist. Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
4. Dipak Shrivastava S/o Shri Prakash Chandra Shrivastava
Aged About 34 Years R/o Gulmohar Park, Ramnagar, Raipur
Dist. Raipur Chhattisgarh, District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh
5. Jyoti Shrivastava W/o Shri Nishant Shrivastava Aged About
37 Years D/o Shri Prakash Chandra Shrivastava R/o Mahoba
Bazar, Parmanandnagar, Raipur Dist. Raipur Chhattisgarh,
District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh --- **Petitioners**

Versus

1. State of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Mahila Police
Thana, Raipur, District Raipur Chhattisgarh, Chhattisgarh
2. Smt. Kritika Shrivastava W/o Shri Neeraj Shrivastava Aged
About 27 Years R/o Laxmi Nagar, Panchpedi Naka, Near
Smita Dresses, P. S. Tikrapara, Raipur Dist. Raipur
Chhattisgarh , District : Raipur, Chhattisgarh --- **Respondents**

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Kashif Shakeel, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Bhaskar Payashi, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri

Order on Board

23.01.2018

1. Heard.
2. The instant petition is for quashing the criminal proceeding
under Section 498-A/34 of IPC in a criminal case No.
10708/2014 pending before the JMFC, Raipur predominantly
the order dated 23.11.2017 whereby the trial Court has
acquitted the petitioners from the charges u/ss 323, 506-B of

IPC in terms of provisions of section 320(8) of Cr.P.C., however, the proceedings under section 498-A remained to continue.

3. As per the case of the petitioner, the FIR was lodged by respondent No. 2 in Mahila Police Station, Raipur which was registered as Crime No. 37/2014 and the charge sheet was filed against the petitioner u/s 498-A, 323, 506-B of IPC. Thereafter during the pendency of criminal case, an application u/s 320 sub section (2) Cr.P.C., was moved by the complainant and joint application was also moved by the accused and the complainant u/s 320 sub section (8) of Cr.PC on the ground that they have compounded the offence and the complainant do not want any further action or prosecute her cause, therefore, the applicants may be acquitted.
4. The parties were directed to record their statements before the Additional Registrar (Judicial) wherein they categorically stated that they have compromised the matter and the statement of complainant would show that she has stated that she do not want to prosecute her complaint in crime no. 37/2014 whereby the criminal case was registered bearing no. 10708/2016.
5. Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the incident happened on a trivial family dispute and no useful purpose would be served to carry on litigation and the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak. It is further contended that it is a family dispute relating to matrimony where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their dispute, therefore, the public at large is not affected, consequently, the proceeding pending before the trial Court may be quashed.

6. Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Another**¹ has laid down the following principles :

“61. 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 predominatingly civil flavour 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

1 (2012) 10 SCC 303

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. Further, in case of *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur & Ors.* in Criminal Appeal No.1723 of 2017 their Lordship again reiterated the view taken in case of *Gian Singh* (supra) and has laid down the following propositions :

“15. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarized in the following propositions :

(i) Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court;

(ii) The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a First Information Report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

(iii) In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power;

(iv) While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised; (i) to secure the ends of

justice or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court;

(v) The decision as to whether a complaint or First Information Report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated;

(vi) In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences;

(vii) As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing in so far as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned;

(viii) Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute;

(ix) In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

(x) There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions (viii) and (ix) above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the state have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.

8. The statement of the complainant/victim was recorded before the Additional Registrar (Judicial). Perused the report along with the statement of accused/ complainant. During course of trial before this court, the State counsel has inquired as to the terms of statement and it has been stated by the complainant that certain monetary settlement has been arrived at between the parties and now Rs. 2 lakhs remained to be paid and it would be paid during the decree of divorce before the court below.
9. Considering the submission made and looking to the *inter-se* relations between the parties and applying the aforesaid principles laid down by the Supreme Court, I am of the opinion that the ends of justice would be sub-served if the the proceedings pending in criminal case No. 10708/2014 before the JMFC, Raipur is quashed. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the proceedings of Criminal Case No.10708/2014 whereby the offence u/s 498-A/34 has been allowed to continue vide order dated 23.11.2016 passed by the JMFC, Raipur is quashed. Consequently, Crime No.37/2014 registered at Mahila Thana, Raipur also stands quashed. The petitioners are acquitted of the charges 498-A of IPC.

**Sd/-
GOUTAM BHADURI
JUDGE**