

\$~38

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 313/2020**

NEERAJ @ DINESH & ORS Petitioners
Through: Mr.Rajesh K. Singh, Advocate

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondents
Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
With SI Jyoti, PS Model Town
Respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER
% **22.01.2020**
CrI.M.A. No. 1344/2020

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

CrI.M.C. No. 313/2020

Vide the present petition, the petitioners seek quashing of the FIR No. 101/2016 PS Model Town registered under Sections 498A/406/34, of the Indian Penal Code 1860 and Section 494 IPC qua Mr.Neeraj @ Dinesh as well as Section 4 of the D.P.Act, submitting to the effect that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties vide the settlement deed dated 22.4.2019 and that no useful purpose would be served by the continuation of the proceedings in relation to the FIR in question.

The Investigating Officer has identified the petitioners No. 1,2

and 4 namely, Neeraj @ Dinesh, Charan Singh and Sethi as being three of the accused persons arrayed in FIR No. 101/2016 under Sections 498A/406/34/494 IPC, 1860 and Section 4 of the D.P.Act present in the Court today. The Investigating Officer has also identified the petitioner No.3 Smt. Bhagwati @ Bhagwan Devi on the basis of her proof of identity at page 22 of the petition. The Investigating Officer has also identified the respondent No.2 present in the Court today as being the complainant of the said FIR.

The respondent no.2 has produced her original proof of identity, copy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/A. The respondent no.2 in her examination on oath by the Court has affirmed having signed her affidavit annexed to the petition bearing her signatures at points A & B on Ex.CW-2/B and the compromise/ settlement dated 22.4.2019 between her and the petitioner No.1 bearing her signatures thereon on each page as visible at point A on EX.CW-2/C voluntarily of her own accord without any duress pressure or coercion from any quarter. The respondent No.2 further testified that 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 6.12.2019 in HMA No. 1940/19 of the Court of the Judge, Family Courts, North, Rohini Courts Delhi. The copy of the decree of divorce is EX.CW-2/D. Further in view of the settlement arrived between her and the petitioner No.1, a total sum of Rs.4,00,000/- had been agreed to be paid to her by the petitioner No.1 towards all her claims out of which a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- had been received by her previously during the proceedings under Section

13 B(1) and 13 B(2) in HMA No. 1940/19 and the balance sum of Rs.1,00,000/- has been handed over to her by the petitioner No.1 today vide a Demand Draft bearing No. 653702 dated 21.1.2020 drawn on Andhra Bank in her favour copy of which is EX.CW-2/E. She further stated that there are now no claims of her left against the petitioners and in terms of the settlement deed dated 22.4.2019 she has handed over the keys of the property bearing No. B-90, Gali No. 11, Kaushik Enclave, Burari, Delhi today to Mr. Charan Singh, who on being testified on Oath has affirmed having received the keys of the said premises. The respondent No.2 further submitted that in view of the settlement arrived at between her and the petitioners, she does not oppose the prayer made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR No. 101/2016 under Sections 498A/406/34/494 IPC, 1860 PS Model Town and Section 4 of the D.P.Act 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 studied till standard 8th and has understood the implications of making any statement 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

petitioner no.1 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, 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. 101/2016 PS Model Town under Sections 498A/406/34/494 IPC, 1860 and Section 4 of the D.P.Act and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioners are thus quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

JANUARY 22, 2020/SV

Item No. 38

CRL.M.C. 313/2020

NEERAJ @ DINESH & ORS V. STATE & ORS.

**CW-1 SI JYOTI PS MODEL TOWN
ON S.A.**

I have been deputed in relation to FIR No. 101/2016 under Sections 498A/406/34/494 IPC, 1860 and Section 4 of the D.P.Act. I identify the petitioners No. 1, 2 and 4, namely, Neeraj @ Dinesh, Charan Singh and Sethi as being three of the accused persons arrayed in FIR No. 101/2016 under Sections 498A/406/34/494 IPC, 1860 and Section 4 of the D.P.Act present in the Court today. I also identify the petitioner No.3 is Smt. Bhagwati @ Bhagwan Devi on the basis of her proof of identity at page 22. 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
22.1.2020**

Item No. 38

CRL.M.C. 313/2020

NEERAJ @ DINESH & ORS V. STATE & ORS.

**CW-3 CHARAN SINGH S/O NAKSE LAL AGED 55 YEARS R/O c-50,
GAUTAM COLONY, NARELA, DELHI.
ON S.A.**

In terms of the settlement dated 22.4.2019 on which I have affixed my thumb impression thereon on Ex.CW-2/C, I have received the keys of property bearing No. B-90, Gali No. 11, Kaushik Enclave, Burari, Delhi from the respondent No.2.

ANU MALHOTRA, J.

**RO & AC
22.1.2020**

Item No. 38

CRL.M.C. 313/2020

NEERAJ @ DINESH & ORS V. STATE & ORS.

**CW-2 RAKHI D/O LATE SH. SARVESH R/O A-145, A-BLOCK
DEWARAL NAGAR, DELHI AGED 28 YEARS.
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 annexed to the petition bears my signatures at points A & B on Ex.CW-2/B. The compromise/ settlement dated 22.4.2019 between me and the petitioner No.1 bears my signatures thereon on each page as visible at point A on EX.CW-2/C. I have signed these documents voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter. 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 6.12.2019 in HMA No. 1940/19 of the Court of the Judge, Family Courts, North, Rohini Courts Delhi. The copy of the decree of divorce is EX.CW-2/D. Further in view of the settlement arrived between me and the petitioner No.1 a total sum of Rs.4,00,000/- had been agreed to be paid to me by the petitioner No.1 towards my all claims out of which a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- had been received by me previously during the proceeding under Section 13 B(1) and 13 B(2) in HMA No. 1940/19 and the balance sum of Rs.1,00,000/- has been handed over to me by the petitioner No.1 today vide a Demand Draft bearing No. 653702 dated 21.1.2020 drawn on Andhra Bank in my favour copy of which is EX.CW-2/E. There are now no claims of mine left against the petitioners. In terms of the settlement deed dated 22.4.2019 I have

handed over the keys of the property bearing No. B-90, Gali No. 11, Kaushik Enclave, Burari, Delhi to Charan Singh, today. In view of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioners, I do not oppose the prayer made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR No. 101/2016 under Sections 498A/406/34/494 IPC, 1860 and Section 4 of the D.P.Act 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 studied till standard 8th and have understood the implications of making any statement. I have made my statement voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter.

ANU MALHOTRA, J.

RO & AC
22.1.2020