

\$~33

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3524/2019**

MR.AMRIK SINGH & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Gurbaksh Singh, Advocate with
Petitioner Nos.1,2 and 4 in person

versus

STATE & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State
with SI Ramesh, PS Nihal Vihar.
Mr.Yogesh K.Chandna, Advocate
along with for R-2 in person
R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER

% **17.02.2020**

CRL.M.C. 3524/2019

Vide the present petition, the petitioners seek the quashing of the FIR No.586/2016, PS Nihal Vihar 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 and the respondent no.2 and that 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 No.1 Amrik Singh, Petitioner No.2 Smt. Babita Kaur and Petitioner No.4 Mr.Harjinder Singh present in Court and the proof of identity of Petitioner No.3 Smt. Gopi Kaur placed at page 60 of the petition as being the accused arrayed in FIR No.586/2016 PS Nihal Vihar under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, 1860

and has also identified the respondent no.2 Ms. Charanjeet Kaur as being the complainant of the said FIR.

The respondent no.2 has produced her original proof of identity, photocopy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/A and in her deposition on oath on examination by the Court has affirmed having signed her affidavit in support of the averments made in the petition at points A & B on Ex.CW2/B as well as the certified copy of the settlement dated 23.05.2018 which has since been arrived at between her and the petitioner no.1 at the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi as visible at point A on Ex.CW2/C with its modified terms as recorded during the course of the proceedings in HMA No.120/19 on 23.04.2019 before the Court of Additional Principal Judge, Family Courts (West), Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, copy of which is Ex.CW2/D bears her signatures thereon at points A., which she has stated 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 in terms of the settlement between her and the petitioner no.1, a total sum of Rs.3,20,000/- was agreed to be paid to her by the petitioner no.1, of which, a sum of Rs.2,70,000/- has already been received by her previously and the balance sum of Rs.50,000/- has now been handed over to her by the petitioner no.1 vide a demand draft bearing No.140620 dated 11.02.2020 drawn on Union Bank of India in her favour and has further stated that there are now no claims of hers left against the petitioners. The Respondent No.2 has further testified to

the effect that the marriage between her and the petitioner no.1 has been dissolved vide a decree of divorce through mutual consent under Section 13B (2) of the HMA dated 23.04.2019 in HMA Petition No.120/19 vide a decree of the Court of the Addl.Principal Judge, Family Courts (West), THC, copy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/E.

The Respondent No.2 has further stated that she has studied till 8th standard and running a beauty parlour and has understood the implications of the statement made by her and further stated that she does not oppose the prayer made by the petitioners seeking the quashing of the FIR No.586/2016, PS Nihal Vihar registered under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor does she want the petitioners to be punished in relation thereto.

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.

In as much as the FIR has apparently emanated from a matrimonial discord between the parties which has been resolved by the dissolution of marriage between the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2 and all the claims having been settled, 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),

In view thereof, the FIR No.586/2016, PS Nihal Vihar registered under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioner No.1 Shri Amrik Singh, Petitioner No.2 Smt. Babita Kaur, Petitioner No.3 Smt. Gopi Kaur and Petitioner No.4 Mr.Harjinder Singh are thus quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

FEBRUARY 17, 2020/SG

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI: NEW DELHI

33

CRL.M.C. 3524/2019

MR.AMRIK SINGH & ORS. VS. STATE & ANR.

17.02.2020

CW-1 SI Ramesh Kumar, PS Nihal Vihar.

ON S.A.

I identify the petitioner No.1 Amrik Singh, Petitioner No.2 Smt. Babita Kaur and Petitioner No.4 Mr.Harjinder Singh present in Court and the proof of identity of Petitioner No.3 Smt. Gopi Kaur placed at page 60 of the petition as being the accused arrayed in FIR No.586/2016 PS Nihal Vihar under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, 1860 and I also identify the respondent no.2 Ms.Charanjeet kaur as being the complainant thereof.

RO & AC
17.02.2020

ANU MALHOTRA, J

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI: NEW DELHI

33

CRL.M.C. 3524/2019

MR.AMRIK SINGH & ORS. VS. STATE & ANR.

17.02.2020

CW-2 Ms. Charanjeet Kaur, D/o Late Shri Jagat Singh R/o B-15A, Block-B, Uday Vihar, Nilothi Extension, New Delhi-110041.

ON S.A.

I have brought my original Aadhaar Card, copy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/A. My affidavit in response to the petition bears my signatures thereon at points A & B thereon on Ex.CW2/B. A settlement has since been arrived at between me and the petitioner no.1 at the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts dated 23.05.2018, copy of which is Ex.CW2/C bearing my signatures thereon at point A. The terms of the settlement between me and the petitioner no.1 were further modified during the course of the proceedings in HMA No.120/19, as per the joint statement dated 23.04.2019, copy of which is Ex.CW2/D bears my signatures thereon at points A.

A sum of Rs.50,000/- was agreed to be paid by the petitioner no.1 to me at the time of seeking of the quashing of the FIR No.586/16 PS Nihal Vihar out of the total settled sum of Rs.3,20,000/-.

I have signed all these documents voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter.

In terms of the settlement between me and the petitioner no.1, a total sum of Rs.3,20,000/- was agreed to be paid to me by the petitioner no.1, of which, a sum of Rs.2,70,000/- has already been received by me previously

and the balance sum of Rs.50,000/- has now been handed over to me by the petitioner no.1 vide a demand draft bearing No.140620 dated 11.02.2020 drawn on Union Bank of India in my favour.

There are now no claims of mine left against the petitioners.

In terms of the settlement between me and the petitioner no.1, the marriage between me and the petitioner no.1 has since been dissolved vide a decree of divorce through mutual consent under Section 13B (2) of the HMA dated 23.04.2019 in HMA Petition No.120/19 vide a decree of the Court of the Addl.Principal Judge, Family Courts (West), THC, copy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/E.

In view of the settlement between me and the petitioners, I have no opposition to the prayer made by the petitioners seeking quashing of the FIR FIR No.586/2016 PS Nihal Vihar under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, 1860 nor do I want the petitioners to be punished in relation thereto.

I have studied till 8th standard and running a beauty parlour.

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

RO & AC
17.02.2020

ANU MALHOTRA, J