Signature Not Verified
Signed By:RAM DATT
Signing Date:07.10.2024 15:21
Certify that the digital and physical file have been compared and the digital data is as per the physical file and no page is missing.

$~3 & 66

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

\+ W.P.(CRL) 2619/2018

PARVEJ & ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Chitra Goswami, Advocate alongwith petitioners.

Versus

THE STATE & ANR ..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Nandita Rao, ASC for State with SI Sandeep Kumar.
Respondent no. 2.

\+ CRL.M.C. 4459/2018, CRL.M.A. 31282/2018

SUNNY & ORS ..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Chitra Goswami, Advocate alongwith petitioners.

Versus

THE STATE & ANR (N.C.T. OF DELHI) ..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Nandita Rao, ASC for State with SI Sandeep Kumar.
Respondent no. 2.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAJMI WAZIRI

ORDER

% 20.09.2018

1. These petitions seek quashing of FIR Nos. 1832/15 and 1833/15 both registered under sections 308/323/34 and 308/324/34, respectively, at Police Station, Mangolpuri.

2. The learned counsel for the parties state that the *lis* has been amicably settled between the parties as per the Memorandum of Settlements/ Compromise Deeds dated 27.08.2018 and 25.08.2018, respectively, whereby

the concerned parties have amicably resolved/settled their disputes, differences and grievances in order to put to end the ongoing litigation in these two FIRs. The parties state that they would like to live peacefully.

3. The parties are present in the Court and have been identified by the Investigating Officer. It is stated that in view of the fact that the parties have settled the *lis* amicably, it will be in the interest of justice to quash the FIRs and all proceedings emanating therefrom.

4. In the aforesaid circumstances and keeping in mind the decision of the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and Another (2012) 10 SCC 303,*** holding that even a non-compoundable offence can also be quashed on the ground of a settlement agreement between the offender and the victim, if the circumstances so warrant; by observing as under:

> *"58. ....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."*

5. The amicable resolution of cases like the present one is an abiding objective. The dictum of ***Gian Singh*** (supra) has been affirmed by the Apex Court in ***Narinder Singh & Ors. Vs. State of Punjab & Anr. 2014 6 SCC 466*** while observing:

*"**29.** 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:*

***29.1.** 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.*

***29.2.** 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.

***29.3.** Such a power is not to 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 the 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.*

***29.4.** On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly 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.

29.5. *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.*

29.6. *Offences under Section 307 IPC would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore are to be generally treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of Section 307 IPC in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of Section 307 IPC is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to proving the charge under Section 307 IPC. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delegate parts of the body, nature of weapons used, etc. Medical report in respect of injuries suffered by the victim can generally be the guiding factor. On the basis of this prima facie analysis, the High Court can examine as to whether there is a strong possibility of conviction or the chances of conviction are remote and bleak. In the former case it can refuse to accept the settlement and quash the criminal proceedings whereas in the latter case it would be permissible for the High Court to accept the plea compounding the offence based on complete settlement between the parties. At this stage, the Court can also be swayed by the fact that the settlement between the parties is going to result in harmony between them which may improve their future relationship.*

> ***29.7.*** *While deciding whether to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Code or not, timings of settlement play a crucial role. Those cases where the settlement is arrived at immediately after the alleged commission of offence and the matter is still under investigation, the High Court may be liberal in accepting the settlement to quash the criminal proceedings/investigation. It is because of the reason that at this stage the investigation is still on and even the charge-sheet has not been filed. Likewise, those cases where the charge is framed but the evidence is yet to start or the evidence is still at infancy stage, the High Court can show benevolence in exercising its powers favourably, but after prima facie assessment of the circumstances/material mentioned above. On the other hand, where the prosecution evidence is almost complete or after the conclusion of the evidence the matter is at the stage of argument, normally the High Court should refrain from exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code, as in such cases the trial court would be in a position to decide the case finally on merits and to come to a conclusion as to whether the offence under Section 307 IPC is committed or not. Similarly, in those cases where the conviction is already recorded by the trial court and the matter is at the appellate stage before the High Court, mere compromise between the parties would not be a ground to accept the same resulting in acquittal of the offender who has already been convicted by the trial court. Here charge is proved under Section 307 IPC and conviction is already recorded of a heinous crime and, therefore, there is no question of sparing a convict found guilty of such a crime."*

6. The Court is of the view that since the *lis* has been amicably settled, nothing further survives in these cases and both the FIRs have been denuded of their substratum and any further proceedings emanating therefrom would be an exercise in futility, therefore, in the interest of justice, the FIRs should be quashed.

7. In the circumstances, FIR Nos. 1832/15 and 1833/15 both registered under sections 308/323/34 and 308/324/34, respectively, at Police Station, Mangolpuri and all proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

8. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioners submits that as an expression of their remorse for the unfortunate incident and the trouble caused to the administrative machinery engaged in maintaining the law and order, the petitioners are willing to do some social work as may be directed by this Court.

9. Accordingly, the petitioners are directed to report to the Deputy Commissioner concerned of the North West Zone on 03.10.2018 at 11.00 am, for assignment of duties for supervision in removal of garbage, municipal solid waste and for supervision in cleaning of drainage as well as inspection of sewers from blockages in the area for a period of two weeks. Affidavit of compliance, by the petitioners as well as of the Deputy Commissioner concerned, shall be filed in this Court after the completion of the said social work. If the affidavits are not filed by 01.11.2018, the case shall be listed for directions.

10. The petitions, alongwith pending applications, are disposed-off in the above terms.

11. A copy of this order be sent to the office of Deputy Commissioner concerned of the North West Zone for compliance.

NAJMI WAZIRI, J.

SEPTEMBER 20, 2018
RW