

\$~23

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4588/2019**

SH. AZAD @ SONU & ORS Petitioner
Through: **Ms.Monika Sharma, Advocate**

versus

STATE & ANR Respondents
Through: **Ms.Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State**
with SI Ramesh Kumar, PS Nihal
Vihar.
Ms.Arati Sharma, Adv for R-2 with R-
2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER

%

10.01.2020

Vide the present petition, the petitioners seek quashing of the FIR No. 302/2013 PS Nihal Vihar, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 submitting to the effect that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties and no useful purpose would be served by the continuation of the proceedings in relation to the FIR in question.

The Investigating Officer of the case has identified the petitioners No. 1 to 3, namely, Azad @ Sonu, Dhanpati and Suman as being the accused arrayed in the FIR No. 302/2013 PS Nihal Vihar, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and has also identified the petitioner No.4, namely, Jeetan as per the amended memo of parties dated 6.1.2020, as being the accused arrayed in the

FIR in question and has also identified respondent no.2 present in 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 and has affirmed having signed her affidavit the EX.CW2/B and the settlement document arrived at between her and the petitioner No.1 at the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts Delhi dated 17.05.2014 bearing her signatures as visible at point A on EX.CW-2/C, voluntarily of her own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter. She further states that in terms of the settlement arrived at between her and the petitioner No.1 dated 17.5.2014 a total sum of Rs.1,80,000/- had been agreed to be paid to her by the petitioner No.1 towards all her claims which sum has been received by her. She further affirms the factum 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(1) and 13-B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, in HMA No. 703/2015 of the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Courts, North West, Tis Hazari Courts, copy of which is Ex.CW-2/D. She further states that there are now no claims of hers left against the petitioners and 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 3, *namely*, Azad @ Sonu, Dhanpati and Suman seeking quashing of the FIR No. 302/2013 PS Nihal Vihar, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor does she want the petitioner Nos. 1 to 3 to be punished in relation thereto in view of the settlement arrived at

between her and the petitioners and she has since remarried nor does she want Jeetan, her brother-in-law, named in the amended memo of parties dated 6.1.2020 as petitioner No.4 to be punished in relation thereto. She further stated she has studied till 6th or 7th standard and that she has made her statement voluntarily of her own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter and after understanding the implications of the statement.

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.

There appears no reason to disbelieve the statement made by the respondent no.2 that she has arrived at a settlement with the petitioners and has since remarried and 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 that 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. 302/2013 PS Nihal Vihar, 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.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

JANUARY 10, 2020/sv

Item No.23

CRL.M.C. 4588/2019

AZAD @ SONU & ORS. V. THE STATE & ANR.

CW-1 SI RAMESH KUMAR PS NIHAL VIHAR

I identify the petitioners No. 1 to 3, namely, Azad @ Sonu, Dhanpati and Suman as being the accused arrayed in the FIR No. 302/2013 PS Nihal Vihar, under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860. I also identify the petitioner No.4, namely, Jeetan as per the amended memo of parties dated 6.1.2020. I also identify the respondent No.2 as being the complainant of the said FIR.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

RO & AC

10.1.2020

Item No.23

CRL.M.C. 4588/2019

AZAD @ SONU & ORS. V. THE STATE & ANR.

**CW-2 GEETA D/O RATAN LAL, AGED 26 YEARS R/O C-367,
NIHAL VIHAR, 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 settlement document arrived at between me and the petitioner No.1 at the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts Dehi dated 17.05.2014 bears my signatures 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.

In terms of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioner No.1 dated 17.5.2014 a total sum of Rs.1,80,000/- had been agreed to be paid to me by the petitioner No.1 towards my all claims which sum has been received by me. 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(1) and 13-B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955, in HMA No. 703/2015 of the Court of the Principal Judge, Family Courts, North West, Tis Hazari Courts. The certified copy of the same is Ex.CW-2/D. There are now no claims of mine left against the petitioners. There are now no claims of mine left against the petitioners. 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 3, *namely*, Azad @ Sonu, Dhanpati and Suman seeking quashing of the FIR No. 302/2013 PS Nihal Vihar, under Sections

498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor do I want the petitioner Nos. 1 to 3 to be punished in relation thereto in view of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioners and I have since remarried nor do I want Jeetan, my brother-in-law, named in the amended memo of parties dated 6.1.2020 as petitioner No.4 to be punished in relation thereto. I have so stated voluntarily of her my own accord without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter.

I have studied till standard 6 or 7. I have made my statement after understanding the implications of the 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

10.01.2020