

\$~29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 341/2020 & CRL.M.A. 1474/2020**

RAJENDER MANGLA & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Petitioners in person with Mr. Rohit Chauhan, Mr. Sagar S. Jaiswal & Ms. Kirti Gupta, Advocates.

versus

STATE & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State with ASI Jitender, PS Khyala.
R-2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER

%

23.01.2020

CRL.M.A. 1474/2020 (Ex.)

Exemption allowed subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 341/2020

Vide the present petition, the petitioners seek the quashing of the FIR No.187/2018, PS Khyala under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 submitting to the effect that a settlement has been arrived at between the petitioner no. 1 and the respondent no. 2 and that the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 are living together peacefully without any problems now and no useful purpose would be served by the continuation of the proceedings in the present FIR.

The Investigating Officer of the case is present and has identified the

petitioner nos. 1 to 3 i.e. petitioner no.1 Rajender Mangla, petitioner no.2 Jyoti Mangla and petitioner no.3 Geeta Mangla as being three of the accused arrayed in the FIR No.187/2018, PS Khyala under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and he has also identified the respondent no.2 Ms. Varsha Mangla as being the complainant of the said FIR. He has further stated that the other two persons namely Bharat Mangla and Shama Mangla are not arrayed as a party to the present petition and has also affirmed that on verification that has been conducted by him, he states that the respondent no.2 is living with the petitioner no.1.

The respondent no.2 has produced her original proof of identity, photocopy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/A. The respondent no.2 in her deposition on oath has affirmed having signed her affidavit in response to the petition at points A & B on Ex.CW2/B as well as the settlement that has been arrived at between her and the petitioner no.1 in the Court of the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, THC, New Delhi at the Counselling Cell at point A on Ex.CW2/C, which she states that she has signed all these documents voluntarily of her own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter. She has further testified to the effect that the proceedings in the Family Courts, THC Courts, New Delhi have since concluded and that she is now living with the petitioner no.1 for the last 1 ½ years without any problems. She has further testified to the effect that the FIR was also lodged against Bharat Mangla and Shama Mangla i.e. her Jeth and Jethani but they are not arrayed as parties to the present petition. She has further stated that in view of the settlement arrived at between her and the petitioner no.1, she does not oppose the prayer made

by the petitioners seeking the quashing of the FIR No.187/2018, PS Khyala under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor does she want the petitioners to be punished in relation thereto and she has further stated that she does not seek any further continuation of the proceedings in the FIR qua the other two accused persons namely Bharat Mangla and Shama Mangla also.

In reply to a specific Court query, the respondent no.2 has stated that she has studied till Standard X 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, coercion or pressure 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 view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

In view of the statement made by 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, in as much as, the FIR has apparently emanated from a matrimonial discord between the parties which has since been resolved by the reconciliation between the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2, it is considered appropriate in the interest of justice for maintenance of peace and harmony between the petitioners and the respondent no.2 as well as for the well being of the respondent no.2 to put a quietus to the litigation between the parties 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),

In view thereof, the FIR No.187/2018, PS Khyala under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioner nos. 1 to 3 i.e. petitioner no.1 Rajender Mangla, petitioner no.2 Jyoti Mangla and petitioner no.3 Geeta Mangla are thus quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

Copy of the order be given Dasti, as prayed.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

JANUARY 23, 2020

‘neha chopra’

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI: NEW DELHI

29

CRL.M.C. 341/2020

RAJENDER MANGLA & ORS.Vs. STATE & ANR.

23.01.2020

CW-1 ASI Jitender, PS Khyala.

ON S.A.

I identify the petitioner nos. 1 to 3 i.e. petitioner no.1 Rajender Mangla, petitioner no.2 Jyoti Mangla and petitioner no.3 Geeta Mangla as being three of the accused arrayed in the FIR No.187/2018, PS Khyala under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and I also identify the respondent no.2 Ms. Varsha Mangla as being the complainant of the said FIR.

The other two persons namely Bharat Mangla and Shama Mangla are not arrayed as a party to the present petition. On verification that has been conducted by me, I state that the respondent no.2 is living with the petitioner no.1.

RO & AC
23.01.2020

ANU MALHOTRA, J

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI: NEW DELHI

29

CRL.M.C. 341/2020

RAJENDER MANGLA & ORS.Vs. STATE & ANR.

23.01.2020

CW-2 Ms. Varsha Mangla, w/o Sh.Rajender Mangla, d/o Sh. Mahesh Kumar, age 21 years, r/o B-1/130, Raghubir Nagar, New Delhi.

ON S.A.

I have brought my original proof of identity, photocopy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/A. My affidavit in response to the petition bears my signatures at points A & B on Ex.CW2/B.

A settlement was arrived at between me and the petitioner no.1 in the Court of the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court, THC, New Delhi at the Counselling Cell, copy of which also bears my signatures thereon as visible at point A on Ex.CW2/C, I have signed all these documents voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter. The proceedings in the Family Courts, THC Courts, New Delhi have since concluded.

I am living with the petitioner no.1 for the last 1 ½ years without any problems now. In view thereof, I thus, do not oppose the prayer made by the petitioners seeking the quashing of the FIR No.187/2018, PS Khyala under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor do I want the petitioners to be punished in relation thereto.

The FIR was also lodged against Bharat Mangla and Shama Mangla i.e. my Jeth and Jethani but they are not arrayed as a party to the present petition. I do not seek the continuation of the proceedings in the FIR qua the

other two accused persons namely Bharat Mangla and Shama Mangla.

I have studied till Standard X.

I have made my statement after understanding the implications thereof voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter.

RO & AC
23.01.2020

ANU MALHOTRA, J