

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****CRMP No. 2543 of 2018**

1. Smt. Sapna Rawat W/o Shri Ashish Rawat Aged About 38 Years
2. Ashish Rawat S/o Dwarika Prasad Aged About 45 Years

Petitioners No.1 & 2 are R/o Kumhar Para In Front Of Pole Factory Jagdalpur ,police Station Bodhghat ,district Bastar Chhattisgarh

3. Dilip Pradhan S/o Sagar Pradhan Aged About 30 Years
4. Pawan Mishra S/o Rajeshwar Prasad Mishra Aged About 35 Years

Petitioners No.3 and 4 are R/o Hatakchora ,jagdalpur ,district Bastar Chhattisgarh.

**---- Petitioners**

**Versus**

1. Vikas Dau S/o Shri Onkar Prasad Dau Caste Baniya R/o Maharani Ward Jagdalpur ,district Bastar Chhattisgarh

**---- Respondent**

---

For Petitioners : Shri Vivek Sharma, Advocate

For Respondent : Shri Gary Mukhopadhyay, Advocate

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Goutam Bhaduri****Order On Board**

**06/03/2019**

1. Heard.
2. The present petition is to quash the proceedings of criminal case No.60/2012 in between Vikas Dau Vs. Sapna Rawat & others pending before the JMFC, Jagdalpur, District Bastar, Chhattisgarh.
3. As per the case, a complaint was registered against the petitioners No.1 to 3 that they have forcefully taken away the tractor bearing No.CG 17 G 1732, which belonged to the respondent/complainant without his permission. During such process a gold chain was also snatched followed with the abuse and

assault. It is stated that the petitioners and the respondent/complainant are related to each other and the reason of dispute is over the alleged vehicle/tractor which belonged to one Motilal Dau was claimed by both the parties i.e. the complainant/respondent as also the accused.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the dispute being inter se between the family members, they have amicably settled the dispute and they are close related to each other and the trivial dispute has been inflated and in order to keep the harmony of the family complainant do not want to continue with the criminal prosecution. Accordingly, the complaint may be quashed.
5. Perusal of the record would show that on a complaint made by one Vikas Dau the respondent, the offence under Sections 147, 341, 294, 323, 395 & 506-II IPC was registered against the petitioners by the JMFC, Jagdalpur on 10.07.2012 and still the criminal case is pending. Perusal of the complaint would also show that the parties are closely related to each other and both the parties are claiming their right over the vehicle through one Motilal Dau. The statement of the accused persons as also the complainant was recorded before the Additional Registrar (Judicial). Perusal of the statement of the complainant Vikas Dau shows that he has stated that he do not want to further prosecute his complaint and the compromise has been arrived at in between the parties without any undue influence, pressure or favour.
6. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Another**<sup>1</sup> 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

---

<sup>1</sup> (2012) 10 SCC 303

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 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. V. State of Gujarat & ors. {(2017) 9 SCC 641}*** 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 summarised 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. Considering the submission made by learned counsel for the parties and the principles laid down by the Supreme Court and also taking into the statement of the complainant, it appears that the complainant and the petitioners are related to each other and over a family dispute the alleged complaint was filed. Since the complainant has voluntarily stated that he do not want to prosecute his complaint and the complaint is inter se private in nature in between the complainant and the petitioners as such no purpose would be served in continuing the prosecution. Under the circumstances, it is directed that the proceedings against the petitioners pending before the JMFC, Jagdalpur, District Bastar in criminal case No.60/2012 under Sections 147, 341, 294, 323, 395 and 506-II IPC shall stand quashed. The petitioners are acquitted of the charges leveled against them.
9. Accordingly, the CRMP stands allowed.

Sd/-

Goutam Bhaduri  
Judge

Ashu