

\$~42

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 1480/2018 & CRL.M.A. 5373/2018**
AJAY SONI @ AJAY VERMA & ORS Petitioner
Through Mr. Tarun Arora, Mr. Gaurav
Bhatnagar, Ms. Ankita Sharma, Adv.
with petitioners in person.

versus

STSATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondent
Through Mr. Izhar Ahmad, APP for State with
SI Avnish Kumar PS Farsh Bazar.
Mr. Monu Bansal, Adv. for R2 with
R2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

% **ORDER**
22.03.2018

CRL.M.A. 5373/2018

CRL.M.A. 5373/2018 is an application filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking exemption from filing certified copies of the annexures. The same is allowed, subject to just exceptions.

The application is disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 1480/2018

Vide the present petition, the petitioner no. 1 Ajay Soni @ Ajay Verma, the petitioner no. 2 Chand Verma s/o Sh. Nathu Ram Verma, the petitioner no. 3 Smt. Raj Rani Verma w/o Sh. Chand Verma, the petitioner no. 4 Pradeep @ Deepak Verma s/o Sh. Chand Verma and the petitioner

CRL.M.C. 1480/2018

page 1 of 7

no.5 Smt. Poonam Verma w/o Sh. Ashish Verma seek quashing of FIR No. 19/15, registered at PS Farsh Bazar, under Section 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 submitting to the effect that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties and that the marriage between the petitioner no. 1 and the respondent has been dissolved vide a decree of divorce through mutual consent under Section 13(B)(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 vide decree dated 24.02.2018 in HMA No. 848/18 of the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Court, West District, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi and that all the claims between the petitioners and the respondent no. 2 have been settled in terms of the Compromise Deed dated 23.09.2017 whereby a total sum of Rs.11,50,000/- was to be paid to the respondent no. 2 by the petitioners of which Rs.9 lakhs has been received by the respondent no. 2 previously and the balance sum of Rs.2,50,000/- has been received by the respondent no. 2 from the petitioners vide DD No. 219179 dated 06.02.2018 drawn on Indian Bank in her favour.

The Investigating Officer of the case present today in Court has identified the petitioner no. 1 Ajay Soni @ Ajay Verma, the petitioner no. 2 Chand Verma s/o Sh. Nathu Ram Verma, the petitioner no. 3 Smt. Raj Rani Verma w/o Sh. Chand Verma, the petitioner no. 4 Pradeep @ Deepak Verma s/o Sh. Chand Verma and the petitioner no. 5 Smt. Poonam Verma w/o Sh. Ashish Verma as being the accused in relation to the FIR No. 19/15, registered at PS Farsh Bazar, under Section 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and submits that apart from the petitioners, there are no other persons named as accused in the said FIR. He has also identified the

respondent no. 2 Smt. Priyank Verma d/o Sh. Ajay Singh Verma present today in the court i.e. the complainant of the said FIR. The proof of the identity of the petitioners and of the respondent no. 2 in the form of photocopies of their documents produced by them are Ex. CW1/A to Ex. CW1/F respectively, originals of which have been seen and returned.

The respondent no.2 in her examination on oath by the Court has testified to having sworn her affidavit annexed to the petition as Ex.CW2/B voluntarily of her own accord without any duress or coercion from any quarter. She has further testified that the Compromise Deed dated 23.09.2017 between her and the petitioners has been signed by her voluntarily of her own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter, certified copy of which is on record as Ex.CW2/A. She affirms that in terms of the Compromise Deed dated 23.09.2017 whereby a total sum of Rs.11,50,000/- was to be paid to the respondent no. 2 by the petitioners of which Rs.9 lakhs has been received by the respondent no. 2 previously and the balance sum of Rs.2,50,000/- has been received by the respondent no. 2 today from the petitioners vide DD No. 219179 dated 06.02.2018 drawn on Indian Bank in her favour and that there are no claims of hers are left against the petitioner and that the minor child namely Vashisth Verma born of the wedlock between her and the petitioner no. 1 is in her custody and shall continue to remain in her custody. She has further testified that the marriage between her and the petitioner no.1 has been dissolved vide a decree of divorce through mutual consent under Section 13(B)(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 vide decree dated 24.02.2018 in *CRL.M.C. 1480/2018*

HMA No. 848/18 of the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Court, West District, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi, the certified copy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/C and has further testified to the effect that she does not oppose the prayer made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR No. 19/15, registered at PS Farsh Bazar, under Section 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor does she want them to be punished in relation thereto. She has submitted that she has studied till standard 10th and that she has made this statement voluntarily of her own accord without any duress or coercion from any quarter.

Learned APP for the State submits that in the circumstances of the case, there is no opposition to the prayer made by the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

In view of the deposition of the respondent no.2 that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties and that the marriage between the respondent no. 2 and the petitioner no.1 has been dissolved vide a decree of divorce through mutual consent under Section 13(B)(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 vide decree dated 24.02.2018 in HMA No. 848/18 of the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Court, West District, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi, there appears no reason to disbelieve her statement that she has made her statement voluntarily of her own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter and taking into account the non-opposition on behalf of the State for maintenance of peace and harmony between the petitioners and the respondent no.2 and for the well being of the child, it is

considered essential to put *a quietus* to the litigation in view of the observations in the verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in view of the observations in the verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Another***, (2012) 10 SCC 303, to the effect : -

*“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.]”

and in view of the observations in the verdict of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Jitendra Raghuvanshi & Ors. Vs. Babita Raghuvanshi & Anr.* (2013) 4 SCC 58, to the effect : -

“15. In our view, it is the duty of the courts to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes, particularly, when the same are on considerable increase. Even if the offences are non-compoundable, if they relate to matrimonial disputes and the Court is satisfied that the parties have settled the same amicably and without any pressure, we hold that for the purpose of securing ends of justice, Section 320 of the Code would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing of FIR, complaint or the subsequent criminal proceedings.

16. There has been an outburst of matrimonial disputes in recent times. The institution of marriage occupies an important place and it has an important role to play in the society. Therefore, every effort should be made in the interest of the individuals in order to enable them to settle down in life and live peacefully. If the parties ponder over their defaults and terminate their disputes amicably by mutual agreement instead of fighting it out in a court of law, in order to do complete justice in the matrimonial matters, the courts should be less hesitant in exercising their extraordinary jurisdiction. It is trite to state that the power under Section 482 should be exercised sparingly and with circumspection only when the Court is convinced, on the basis of material on record, that allowing the proceedings to continue would be an abuse of process of

court or that the ends of justice require that the proceedings ought to be quashed....”

(emphasis supplied)

it is considered appropriate to allow the prayer made by the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No. 19/15, registered at PS Farsh Bazar, under Section 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioner. In view thereof the FIR No. 19/15, registered at PS Farsh Bazar, under Section 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioner no. 1 Ajay Soni @ Ajay Verma, the petitioner no. 2 Chand Verma s/o Sh. Nathu Ram Verma, the petitioner no. 3 Smt. Raj Rani Verma w/o Sh. Chand Verma, the petitioner no. 4 Pradeep @ Deepak Verma s/o Sh. Chand Verma and the petitioner no. 5 Smt. Poonam Verma w/o Sh. Ashish Verma are quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

MARCH 22, 2018/MK

CRL.M.C. 1480/2018

page 7 of 7

42

CRL.M.C. 1480/2018

AJAY SONI @ AJAY VERMA & ORS versus
STSATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR

Statement of CW1 : SI Avnish Kumar, PS Farsh Bazar, Delhi.

ON S.A.

I identify the petitioner no. 1 Ajay Soni @ Ajay Verma, the petitioner no. 2 Chand Verma s/o Sh. Nathu Ram Verma, the petitioner no. 3 Smt. Raj Rani Verma w/o Sh. Chand Verma, the petitioner no. 4 Pradeep @ Deepak Verma s/o Sh. Chand Verma and the petitioner no. 5 Smt. Poonam Verma w/o Sh. Ashish Verma as being the accused in relation to the FIR No. 19/15, registered at PS Farsh Bazar, under Section 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. Apart from the petitioners, there are no other persons named as accused in the said FIR. I also identify the respondent no. 2 Smt. Priyank Verma d/o Sh. Ajay Singh Verma present today in the court i.e. the complainant of the said FIR. The proof of the identity of the petitioners and of the respondent no. 2 in the form of photocopies of their documents produced by them are Ex. CW1/A to Ex. CW1/F respectively (original seen and returned).

**RO & AC
MARCH 22, 2018/MK**

ANU MALHOTRA, J

Statement of CW2 : Smt. Priyanka Verma d/o Sh. Ajay Singh Verma, aged 30 years r/o 3/387, Pathanpura, Near Geeta Bhawan, Delhi – 32.

ON S.A.

I do not oppose the prayer made by the petitioner no. 1 Ajay Soni @ Ajay Verma, the petitioner no. 2 Chand Verma s/o Sh. Nathu Ram Verma, the petitioner no. 3 Smt. Raj Rani Verma w/o Sh. Chand Verma, the petitioner no. 4 Pradeep @ Deepak Verma s/o Sh. Chand Verma and the petitioner no. 5 Smt. Poonam Verma w/o Sh. Ashish Verma seeking quashing of the FIR No. 19/15, registered at PS Farsh Bazar, under Section 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor I do want them to be punished in relation thereto. In terms of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioners, a total sum of Rs.11,50,000/- was to be paid to me by the petitioners of which Rs.9 lakhs has been received by me previously. The Compromise Deed dated 23.09.2017 between me and the petitioners i.e. the certified copy thereof bears my signatures thereon on each page at points-A on Ex.CW2/A, which I have signed voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter. My affidavit annexed to the petition bears my signature thereon at points-A and B on Ex.CW2/B, which I have signed voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter. The marriage between me and the petitioner no.1 has been dissolved vide a decree of divorce through mutual consent under Section 13(B)(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 vide

decree dated 24.02.2018 in HMA No. 848/18 of the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Court, West District, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi, the certified copy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/C. The minor child namely Vashisth Verma born of the wedlock between me and the petitioner no. 1 is in my custody and shall continue to remain in my custody. The balance sum of Rs.2,50,000/- has been received by me from the petitioners vide DD No. 219179 dated 06.02.2018 drawn on Indian Bank in my favour, photocopy of which is on record as Ex.CW2/D. There are now no claims of mine left against the petitioners. I have studied till standard 10th. I have made this statement voluntarily of my own accord without any duress or coercion from any quarter.

RO & AC
MARCH 22, 2018/MK

ANU MALHOTRA, J