

\$~5

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

Decided on: 10th October, 2018

+ CRL.M.C. 2491/2015

SANDEEP SINGH CHANDOK & ORS Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pradeep Mishra, Advocate
along with petitioner No.1 in
person.

versus

NANCY & ANR Respondents

Through: Ms. Ekta with Mr. Ankit
Jhamb, Mr. Manish Kumar &
Mr. Aman Gupta, Advocates
for R-1 along with R-1 in
person.

Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for
State with SI Chandan, P.A.
K.N.K. Marg.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE R.K.GAUBA

ORDER (ORAL)

1. The first respondent was married to the first petitioner as per Hindu Rites and Ceremonies on 28.11.2004 and from out of their wedlock, a female child named Ms. Sanmir Kaur took birth on 09.06.2008. On 24.03.2012 at the instance of the first respondent, Police Station K.N. Katju Marg registered FIR No. 118/12 wherein the first petitioner had leveled allegations of offences punishable under Sections 498A/406/34 of Indian Penal Code (IPC), *inter alia*, against the husband (first petitioner), his father (the second petitioner), his

mother (the third petitioner) and the sister of the husband (the fourth petitioner). On conclusion of investigation, police filed report under Section 173 Cr.P.C. on which cognizance was taken, the said matter being pending on the file of Metropolitan Magistrate, Rohini District Courts, Delhi.

2. On 10.02.2014, the parties entered into an amicable settlement and executed a memorandum of understanding (MOU) in terms of which they agreed to approach, as per timelines indicated, the proper forum for obtaining a decree of divorce of mutual consent, they also having agreed, *inter alia*, for the criminal case arising out of aforesaid FIR sought to be quashed.

3. The petition, thus, has been moved before this court invoking Article 227 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 Cr. PC seeking quashing of the FIR 118/12 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC of Police Station K.N. Katju Marg.

4. The first respondent on being served with the notice has appeared before this court and in compliance with the directions has submitted her response by affidavit sworn today, the same having been filed in the Registry earlier. By the said affidavit she confirms the submissions of the petitioner about settlement of the dispute through the MOU dated 10.02.2014. In terms of the MOU, the first petitioner was to pay to the first respondent (the complainant) a total amount of Rs.Nine lakhs as full and final settlement of her claim against him. She acknowledges by the said affidavit that she had received Rs.Three lakhs as the first instalment on 05.03.2014 at the

time when the parties were before the family court with the joint petition for divorce by mutual consent, it being the stage of first motion and further that she received second instalment of Rs.Three lakhs on 11.09.2014 when the second motion petition was submitted. It has been conceded by her that on the basis of the said second motion petition, the marriage of the parties has already been dissolved by mutual consent. The balance amount of Rs.Three lakhs is to be paid at the time of consideration of the petition for quashing of the aforementioned FIR. The affidavit is supported by copy of *Adhaar card* of the first respondent, it having been self-attested by her as proof of identity.

5. The first petitioner has handed over at the hearing to the first respondent demand draft bearing no. 079889 dated 05.09.2018 in the sum of Rs.Three lakhs drawn on Standard Chartered Bank, South Extension Part II, New Delhi, of which photocopy has been kept on record, the first respondent having given an acknowledgement of receipt to the first petitioner. The first respondent submits her no objection to the prayer in the petition.

6. Pertinent to note here that offence under Section 498A IPC is not compoundable. The parties are constrained to move this court for quashing on the basis of amicable resolution arrived at by them in the facts and circumstances noted above.

7. The scope and ambit of the power conferred on this court by Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Cr. PC) read with Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, in the particular

context of prayer for quashing criminal proceedings, was examined by the Supreme Court in *B.S. Joshi and Ors. Vs. State of Haryana and Anr.*, (2003) 4 SCC 675, against the backdrop of a catena of earlier decisions. Noting, with reference to the decision in *State of Karnataka Vs. L Muniswamy*, (1977) 2 SCC 699, that in exercise of this “*inherent*” and “*wholesome power*”, the touchstone is as to whether “*the ends of justice so require*”, and it was observed thus :

“10. ... that in a criminal case, the veiled object behind a lame prosecution, the very nature of the material on which the structure of the prosecution rests and the like would justify the High Court in quashing the proceeding in the interest of justice and that the ends of justice are higher than the ends of mere law though justice had got to be administered according to laws made by the legislature. ...that the compelling necessity for making these observations is that without a proper realization of the object and purpose of the provision which seeks to save the inherent powers of the High Court to do justice between the State and its subjects, it would be impossible to appreciate the width and contours of that salient jurisdiction.”

नित्यमेव जयते (emphasis supplied)

8. The Supreme Court in *B.S. Joshi* (supra) further noted as under :-

“What would happen to the trial of the case where the wife does not support the imputations made in the FIR of the type in question. As earlier noticed, now she has filed an affidavit that the FIR was registered at her instance due to temperamental differences and implied imputations. There may be many reasons for not

supporting the imputations. It may be either for the reason that she has resolved disputes with her husband and his other family members and as a result thereof she has again started living with her husband with whom she earlier had differences or she has willingly parted company and is living happily on her own or has married someone else on the earlier marriage having been dissolved by divorce on consent of parties or fails to support the prosecution on some other similar grounds. In such eventuality, there would almost be no chance of conviction. Would it then be proper to decline to exercise power of quashing on the ground that it would be permitting the parties to compound non-compoundable offences? The answer clearly has to be in the “negative”. It would, however, be a different matter if the High Court on facts declines the prayer for quashing for any valid reasons including lack of bona fides.”

(emphasis supplied)

9. Holding that “special features in ...matrimonial matters are evident” and that it is “the duty of the court to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes”, referring to *Madhavrao Jiwarelkar Vs. Sambhajirao Chandrojiroo Angre*, (1988) 1 SCC 692, it was further observed that :

“11. ... Where, in the opinion of the court, chances of an ultimate conviction are bleak and, therefore, no useful purpose is likely to be served by allowing a criminal prosecution to continue, the court may, while taking into consideration the special facts of a case, also quash the proceedings.”

(emphasis supplied)

10. In *Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and Anr.* (2012) 10 SCC 303, the Supreme Court contrasted the request for quashing of criminal proceedings on the basis of settlement with the possibility of compounding of an offence and observed thus :-

“57. Quashing of offence or criminal proceedings on the ground of settlement between an offender and victim is not the same thing as compounding of offence. They are different and not interchangeable. Strictly speaking, the power of compounding of offences given to a court under Section 320 is materially different from the quashing of criminal proceedings by the High Court in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction. In compounding of offences, power of a criminal court is circumscribed by the provisions contained in Section 320 and the court is guided solely and squarely thereby while, on the other hand, the formation of opinion by the High Court for quashing a criminal offence or criminal proceeding or criminal complaint is guided by the material on record as to whether the ends of justice would justify such exercise of power although the ultimate consequence may be acquittal or dismissal of indictment.”

(emphasis supplied)

11. The above views in the context of matrimonial disputes resulting in criminal proceedings have been consistently followed over the years, as may be further illustrated by the decision of a bench of three Hon'ble Judges of the Supreme Court in *Jitendra Raghuvanshi and Ors. Vs. Babita Raghuvanshi and Anr.*, (2013) 4 SCC 58, the following observations summarising the philosophy succinctly :-

“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)

12. In a case where criminal proceedings arise essentially out of *matrimonial* dispute and the parties have decided to bury the hatchet,

the court must examine if there is any likelihood of the criminal prosecution resulting in conviction. In fact-situation wherein the matrimonial relation has been brought to an end by mutual consent and the parties are eager to move on with their respective lives seeking closure and if there is nothing to indicate lack of *bonafide* on the part of any side, denial of the prayer for quashing the criminal case would restore acrimony rather than bring about peace. Allowing continuance of the criminal action would be fruitless and clearly an abuse of judicial process.

13. The case at hand passes the muster of the above-noted tests.

14. In the above facts and circumstances, the petition is allowed. The crime registered by the police vide FIR No. 118/12 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC of Police Station K.N. Katju Marg and the proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

15. The petition is disposed of accordingly.

16. *Dasti* to all sides.

R.K.GAUBA, J.

OCTOBER 10, 2018

srb