

\$~69

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1060/2020**

PRAVEEN KUMAR @ PAWAN & ORS. Petitioners

Through: Mr. J.K. Bhola, Advocate.

versus

STATE & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Ashok Kumar Garg, APP for
State with SI Naveen, PS-Punjabi
Bagh.
Mr. Vishal KS, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

% **26.02.2020**

CRL.M.A. 4227/2020 (Exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 1060/2020

Vide the present petition, the petitioners seek quashing of the FIR No.0093/2018 dated 21.02.2018, PS Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi registered under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 submitting to the effect that a settlement has been arrived at between the petitioners in front of the Additional Principal Judge, Family Court (West), Tis Hazari Court, Delhi and the respondent no.2 and no useful purpose would be served by the continuation of the proceedings in relation to the FIR in question. The Investigating Officer- SI Naveen, PS-Punjabi Bagh of the case has identified the petitioners present in Court as being the accused arrayed in the FIR in

question and has also identified respondent no.2 present in Court as being the complainant of the said FIR.

The respondent no.2 has produced her original Aadhar Card, 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 Ex.CW2/B. The respondent no.2 in her examination on oath by the Court has affirmed having signed her affidavit of her own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter in support of the averments made in the petition.

She has further stated that a minor daughter named- Jeevika was born of the wedlock between her and the petitioner no.1.

She has further stated that in terms of the settlement arrived at between her and the petitioner no.1- Ex.CW2/C, the parties have decided to live together alongwith their minor daughter in a rented accommodation which is to be arranged by Petitioner No.1. She has further stated that there are no claims of hers left against the petitioners now and that she thus has no opposition to the prayer made by the petitioners seeking the quashing of the FIR No.0093/2018 dated 21.02.2018, PS Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi registered under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor does she want the petitioners to be punished in relation thereto. She has further stated that she has made her statement voluntarily after understanding its implications.

There appears no reason to disbelieve the statement made by the respondent no.2 that she has arrived at a settlement with the petitioner voluntarily in as much as the FIR in question has emanated from a matrimonial discord which has since been resolved, 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.0093/2018 dated 21.02.2018, PS Punjabi Bagh, New Delhi registered under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioners are quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

FEBRUARY 26, 2020

nk