

\$~47

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CRL.M.C. 6677/2019 and Crl.M.A. No. 43398/2019

SH. DHARAMVIR SHARMA & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Vipin Kumar, Advocate with
petitioners No.1 and 2 in person.
Petitioners No.3 to 8 are not present.

versus

STATE & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms.Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State
With SI Pushpender PS Ambedkar
Nagar
Ms.Pooja Sharma, Adv for R-2 with
R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER

%

28.01.2020

The Investigating Officer has identified the petitioners No.1 and 2, namely Dharamvir Sharma and Ram Kishan Sharma and the petitioners No. 3 to 8 through the proofs of their identity as being the accused arrayed in the FIR in question which is sought to be quashed i.e., the FIR No.19/14 PS Ambedkar Nagar registered under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

Vide the proceedings dated 23.12.2019, in as much as it was indicated that there was no mention of the criminal proceedings in relation to the FIR No. 19/14, PS Ambedkar Nagar having been agreed to be sought to be quashed and the respondent No.2 was not

assisted by a counsel, the respondent No.2 was referred to the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee and the learned counsel from the DHCLSC is present and submits that she has already communicated with the respondent No.2 and there is no opposition to the prayer made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR No.19/14 PS Ambedkar Nagar registered under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act.

On being examined on oath by the Court, the respondent no.2 has produced her original proof of identity, copy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/A and has affirmed having signed her affidavit in support of the petition Ex.CW-2/B and the mediation settlement arrived at between her and the petitioner No.1 at the Delhi Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi dated. 20.2.2015, the certified copy of the settlement dated 20.2.2015 is EX.CW-2/C, voluntarily of her own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter. The respondent No.2 states that in terms of the settlement arrived at between her and the petitioner No.1 dated 20.2.2015 the marriage between her and the petitioner No.1 has since been dissolved vide a decree of divorce through mutual consent under Section 13-B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 dated 19.11.2015 in HMA No. 1074/15 of the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Courts, South Saket Courts. The certified copy of the decree of divorce is EX.CW-2/D and that in view of the settlement a total sum of Rs.3,25,000/- had been agreed to be paid to her by the petitioner No.1 towards all her claims which sum has already been received by her previously.

She further stated that there are now no claims of hers left against the petitioners and that she has since remarried and thus in view of the settlement arrived at between her and the petitioners, she does not oppose the prayer made by the petitioners no. 1 to 8, *namely*, Dharamvir Sharma, Ram Kishan Sharma, Sheela, Suman @ Kaushik Sumanben, Asha @ Kaushik Ashaben, Madhu Devi, Suman Devi @ Santokh and Kavita seeking quashing of the FIR No.19/14 PS Ambedkar Nagar registered under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 nor does she want the petitioners to be punished in relation thereto in view of the settlement arrived at between her and the petitioners. The respondent No.2 further submitted that she has done graduation and runs a transport business and has understood the implications of the statement made by her and that she has made her statement voluntarily of her own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter.

On behalf of the State, there is no opposition to the prayer made by the petitioners seeking the quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties and the deposition of the respondent No.2.

There appears no reason to disbelieve the statement made by the respondent no.2 that she has arrived at a settlement with the petitioners voluntarily of her own accord without any duress pressure or coercion from any quarter. In view of the statement made by the respondent no.2 and the non-opposition on behalf of the State in as much as the FIR in question has emanated from a matrimonial discord

which has since been resolved vide dissolution of the marriage between the respondent no.2 and the petitioner no. 1 in as much as the respondent no.2 has categorically stated that there are no claims of hers left against the petitioners and she has since remarried, it is considered appropriate to put a quietus to the litigation and disputes between the parties for maintenance of peace and harmony between them as also for the well being of the respondent no.2, in terms of the verdict of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***Narender Singh & Ors. V. State of Punjab***; (2014) 6 SCC 466 wherein it has been observed vide paragraph 31(IV) to the effect:

“31. 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:

(I)

(II)

(III)

(IV) On the other, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and pre-dominantly 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.

.....”

and in view of the observations 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.]”

and in view of the verdict of the Hon’ble Supreme Court in *Jitendra Raghuvanshi & Ors. Vs. Babita Raghuvanshi & Anr.* (2013) 4 SCC 58, to the effect : -

“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),

the FIR No.19/14 PS Ambedkar Nagar registered under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioners are quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

JANUARY 28, 2020/sv

Item No. 47

CRL.M.C. 6677//2019

DHARAMVIR SHARMA &ORS V. STATE & ANR.

**CW-1 SI PUSHPENDER PS AMBEDKAR NAGAR
ON S.A.**

I identify the petitioners No. 1 and 2, namely, Dharamvir Sharma, Ram Kishan Sharma and the identity proofs of the petitioners No. 3 to 8, namely, Sheela, Suman @ Kaushik Sumanben, Asha @ Ashaben, Madhu Devi, Suman Devi @ Santokh and Kavita as being the accused arrayed in FIR No.19/14 PS Ambedkar Nagar registered under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act present in the Court today. I also identify the respondent No.2 present in the Court today as being the complainant of the said FIR.

ANU MALHOTRA, J.

**RO & AC
28.1.2020**

Item No. 47

CRL.M.C. 6677//2019

DHARAMVIR SHARMA &ORS V. STATE & ANR.

**CW-2 MS POOJA SHARMA, D/O SH. FATEH CHAND R/O H.NO. J-5,
DAKSHINPURI, NEW DELHI.
ON S.A.**

I have brought my original proof of identity i.e. Aadhar Card. The photocopy of the same is EX.CW-2/A.

My affidavit in support of the petition bears my signatures at point A & B on Ex.CW-2/B. The mediation settlement arrived at between me and the petitioner No.1 at the Delhi Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi dated. 20.2.2015 bears my signatures at point A. The certified copy of the settlement dated 20.2.2015 is EX.CW-2/C. I have signed these documents voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter. In terms of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioner No.1 dated 20.2.2015 the marriage between me and the petitioner No.1 has since been dissolved vide a decree of divorce through mutual consent under Section 13-B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 dated 19.11.2015 in HMA No. 1074/15 of the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Courts, South Saket Courts. The certified copy of the decree of divorce is EX.CW-2/D. Further in view of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioner No.1 a total sum of Rs.3,25,000/- had been agreed to be paid to me by the petitioner No.1 towards my all claims which sum has already been received by me previously. There are now no claims of mine left against the petitioners. I have since remarried. In view of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioners, I do not oppose the prayer made by the petitioners no. 1 to 8, *namely*, Dharamvir Sharma, Ram Kishan

Sharma, Sheela, Suman @ Kaushik Sumanben, Asha @ Kaushik Ashaben, Madhu Devi, Suman Devi @ Santokh and Kavita seeking quashing of the FIR No.19/14 PS Ambedkar Nagar registered under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 nor do I want the petitioners to be punished in relation thereto in view of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioners.

I have done graduation and run a transport business and have understood the implications of the statement made by me. I have made my statement voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter.

ANU MALHOTRA, J.

RO & AC
28.1.2020