

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

Date of Order: February 18, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 900/2019**

KULDEEP MAURYA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sunil Singh & Mr. Lokesh,
Advocates

Versus

STATE & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. M.P.Singh, Additional Public
Prosecutor for respondent No.1-
State with ASI Ombir
Mr. Jayant Kaushal, Advocate with
respondent No.2 in person

+ **CRL.M.C. 910/2019**

VIPIN Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jayant Kaushal, Advocate

Versus

STATE & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. M.P.Singh, Additional Public
Prosecutor for respondent No.1-
State with ASI Ombir
Mr. Sunil Singh & Mr. Lokesh,
Advocates with respondent No.2 in
person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

In the above captioned first petition, quashing of FIR No.605/2015, whereas in the above captioned second petition, quashing of FIR No.604/2015, both under Sections 354A/323 of IPC, registered at police station Dabri, Delhi is sought. Both the FIRs pertain to one incident. Quashing of these FIRs is sought on the ground that misunderstanding which led to this incident, now stands cleared between the parties in terms of Mediated Settlement of 6th June, 2018 (*Annexure P-3*).

With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, both these petitions have been heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

Mr. M.P.Singh, Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State, accepts notice of these two petitions and submits that Ms. Neetu Pandey is the complainant in FIR No.605/2015 and Ms.Neeru Maurya, is the complainant in FIR No.604/2015 and they have been duly identified to be so by ASI Ombir, Investigating Officer of this case as well as their counsel.

Complainants of these FIRs submit that the misunderstanding, which led to registration of these FIRs, now stands cleared. They submit that both the sides are neighbours and to restore harmony between the parties, proceedings arising out of these two FIRs be brought to an end.

Supreme Court in *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Vs. State of Gujarat* (2017) 9 SCC 641 has reiterated the parameters for exercising inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR / criminal complaint, which are as under:-

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

16.1. 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.

16.2. 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.

16.3. 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.

16.4. 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.

16.5. 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.

16.6. 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.

16.7. 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 insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. 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.

16.9. 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

16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. 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.”

In view of the fact that the incident in question, which led to lodging of these two FIRs, took place on a trivial issue and the misunderstanding amongst the parties now stands cleared, this Court finds that continuance of proceedings arising out of these FIRs would be an exercise in futility.

Accordingly, subject to deposit of consolidated costs of ₹10,000/- by petitioners in the above captioned two petitions with the *Prime Minister's National Relief Fund* within four weeks and after placing proof of deposit of costs on record of this case within two weeks thereafter, the

proceedings arising out of FIR No.605/2015 and FIR No. 604/2015, both registered at police station Dabri, Delhi shall stand quashed.

The above captioned two petitions are accordingly disposed of in aforesaid terms.

Dasti.

**(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE**

FEBRUARY 18, 2019

r

