

\$~54

\* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**  
+ CRL.M.C. 612/2018 & CRL.M.A. 2234-2235/2018  
DHARAMVIR SINGH ..... Petitioner  
Through Mr. K.K. Jha, Ms. Bhavna Sharma,  
Advs. with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR ..... Respondent  
Through Mr. Izhar Ahmad, APP for State with  
ASI Karamvir, PS North Rohini.  
Mr. Gaurav Deep Gupta, Adv. for R2  
with R2 in person.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA**

**ORDER**

%

**06.02.2018**

**CRL.M.A. 2235/2018**

CRL.M.A. 2235/2018 is an application filed on behalf of the petitioner seeking condonation of 50 days delay in re-filing the petition.

In the interest of justice, the said delay is condoned for the reasons as explained in the application.

The application is disposed of.

**CRL.M.C. 612/2018**

Vide the present petition, the petitioner Dharambir Singh s/o Sh. Khadak Singh seeks quashing of the FIR No. 118/12, registered at North Rohini, under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 submitting *inter alia* to the effect that a settlement has been arrived at between the petitioner and the respondent no. 2 amicably and all disputes between the

***CRL.M.C. 612/2018***

***page 1 of 7***

petitioner and the respondent no. 2 have since been resolved.

The Investigating Officer of the case has identified the petitioner Dharambir Singh s/o Sh. Khadak Singh as being the accused in relation to the FIR No. 118/12, registered at North Rohini, under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. He has also identified the respondent no. 2 Kanchan d/o Late Sh. Harbir Singh present today in the court i.e. the complainant of the FIR No. 118/12, registered at North Rohini, under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. It has been testified by the Investigating Officer of the case that other three accused persons namely Nirmala, Sujata Singh and Ashok Singh mentioned in the said FIR were discharged for the offences punishable under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 vide order dated 01.12.2015 of the learned MM (Mahila Court), NW, Rohini, Delhi and the revision petition in relation thereto against the discharge of other three accused persons namely Nirmala, Sujata Singh and Ashok Singh was declined vide order dated 05.05.2016 of the learned Special Judge-III (PC Act) CBI, North West District, Rohini Courts, Delhi in CR No. 9/16 (old) and CR No. 49752/16 (new). Photocopies of the proof of identity in the form of the driving licence of the petitioner and in the form of Aadhar card of the respondent no. 2 are on record, which are Ex. CW1/A and Ex. CW1/B respectively, originals of which have been seen and returned.

The respondent no. 2 on her examination by the Court on oath has testified to having sworn her affidavit as Ex.CW2/A annexed to the petition and has also testified to having signed the settlement arrived at between the parties at the Counselling Cell in the Court of learned Judge Family Court

(North West), Rohini, Delhi, certified copy of which is on record as Ex.CW2/B, which she stated she has signed voluntarily of her own accord without any duress or coercion from any quarter. The respondent no. 2 has testified to the effect that there is no child of the wedlock between herself and the petitioner and that the marriage between herself and the petitioner has since been dissolved vide a decree of divorce dated 27.04.2017 of the Court of the Judge, Family Court, North West, Rohini, Delhi in HMA No. 604/17 under Sections 13B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, certified copy of which is on record as Ex.CW2/D. She has further testified to the effect that pursuant to the said settlement, a total sum of Rs.3,00,000/- was to be paid by the petitioner to her and out of which she has already received a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- previously from the petitioner and the balance sum of Rs.1 lakh has been received by her today from the petitioner vide DD No. 523759 dated 30.01.2018 drawn on Andhra Bank, photocopy of which is on record as Ex.CW2/C. She has further testified that now there are no claims of hers left against the petitioner in relation to the FIR No. 118/12, registered at North Rohini, under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. She has also testified to the effect that there is no child of the wedlock and that she had studied till 12<sup>th</sup> standard and she works as Retail Sales Executive. She has further testified that she does not want the petitioner named above to be punished and she has no opposition to the quashing of the FIR No. 118/12, registered at North Rohini, under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom. She has also testified to the effect that the proceedings in relation to the said FIR against her in-laws namely Nirmala, Sujata Singh and Ashok

*CRL.M.C. 612/2018* *page 3 of 7*

Singh have already been quashed vide order dated 01.12.2015 of the learned MM (Mahila Court), NW, Rohini, Delhi and that the revision petition in relation thereto against their discharge was declined vide order dated 05.05.2016 of the learned Special Judge-III (PC Act) CBI, North West District, Rohini Courts, Delhi in CR No. 9/16 (old) and CR No. 49752/16 (new).

Learned APP for the State also in the circumstances of the case does not oppose the prayer made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR No. 118/12, registered at North Rohini, under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

In view of the dissolution of the marriage between the petitioner and the respondent no. 2 vide a decree of divorce dated 27.04.2017 of the Court of the Judge, Family Court, North West, Rohini, Delhi in HMA No. 604/17 under Sections 13B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 and that all claims between the petitioner and the respondent no. 2 have since been settled, there appears no reason to disbelieve the statement made by the respondent no. 2 that she has arrived at the settlement voluntarily of her own accord without any duress or coercion from any quarter and as the matrimonial discord between the petitioner and the *respondent* no. 2 has been resolved, thus to maintain peace and harmony between the parties, 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.]”*

*(emphasis supplied)*

and in the case of *Jitendra Raghuvanshi & Ors. Vs. Babita Raghuvanshi & CRL.M.C. 612/2018*

*page 5 of 7*

*Anr. (2013) 4 SCC 58*, wherein the Supreme Court in respect of the matrimonial disputes has specifically held as follows:-

*“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 thus considered appropriate in the interest of justice that the prayer

made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR No. 118/12, registered at North Rohini, under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom is allowed and thus the FIR No. 118/12, registered at North Rohini, under Sections 498A/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioner Dharambir Singh s/o Sh. Khadak Singh are quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

**ANU MALHOTRA, J**

**FEBRUARY 06, 2018/MK**