

28.11.2023
Serial no.35
Piya
Ct. No. 30

CRR 1619 of 2020
+
IA No.: CRAN 1 of 2021
+
IA No.:CRAN No. 2 of 2023

Sri Tarun Banerjee
vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Sudipto Maitra
Mr. Vijay Verma
Mr. Dwaipayan Biswas
..... for the Petitioner

Mr. A.K. Gayen
..... for the Respondent

Mr. Ranabir Roychowdhury
Mr. Mainak Gupta
..... for the State

The present revisional application has been preferred praying for quashing of the proceeding in connection with Domkal Police Station Case No. 54 of 2020 dated 02.02.2020 under Sections 420/406 of the Indian Penal Code corresponding G.R. No. 380/2020 pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Murshidabad.

The parties to the revision have now jointly filed CRAN 2 of 2023 on affidavit praying for disposal of the present case on the basis of the compromise effected between the parties.

The applicants state that applicants have mutually and out of their own will and volition decided and agreed to amicably settle and compromise the disputes pending between them.

The applicants state that on the basis of such mutual understanding, the disputes by and between the applicants have already been amicably settled.

It is further stated that the aggrieved persons have prayed that the offences in the present case may be compounded and at present they have no claim or grievance against the accused persons in view of the compromise between the parties.

A Three Judge Bench of the Court in **(2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases, 303, Gian Singh vs State of Punjab** and another has cleared the position in respect of the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceedings in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction in para 61 of the judgment, which is reproduced here in:-

“The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus : the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz. : (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious

impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

In Anita Maria Dias & Anr. vs The State of Maharashtra & Anr. (2018) 3 SCC 290.

The Court held:-

- (a) *Offences which are predominant of civil character, commercial transaction should be quashed when parties have resolved their dispute.*

(b) Timing of settlement would be crucial for exercise of power or declining to exercise power (stage of proceedings).

The joint application filed an affidavit by the parties clearly shows that an amicable settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the parties and the complainant does not wish to proceed with the G.R. Case No. 380 of 2020, pending before the Court of the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Murshidabad, arising out of Domkal Police Station Case No. 54 of 2020 dated 02.02.2020 under Sections 420/406 of the Indian Penal Code, which is pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate at Murshidabad in respect of the petitioner.

It is stated that the defacto complainant/opposite party no. 2/applicant no. 2 and the petitioner/applicant no. 1 having good acquaintance for a long period and due to some misunderstanding there was breach of said relationship between the opposite party no. 2/applicant no. 2 and the petitioner/applicant no. 1 and as a result of which cases were instituted against the each other.

That the petitioner/applicant no. 1 prior to the institution of the present case instituted the Beliaghata P.S. Case No. 177 of 2018, dated 11.08.2018, under Sections 465/467/385/389/506 (II)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 against the opposite party no. 2/applicant no. 2.

It is now submitted that ultimately, good senses prevailed over the parties and due to intervention of the common friends

and well-wishers parties understood their misgivings and rivalry between the opposite party no. 2/applicant no. 2 and the petitioner/applicant no. 1 has been wiped out and amenity and good relation restored between the parties.

From the materials on record, it is clear that dispute in the present case is private in nature and the parties have now resolved their entire dispute (there being a case and counter case) by way of a compromise/settlement on affidavit. The ingredients required to constitute the offences alleged are also prima facie absent against the petitioners, the dispute being that money for job was allegedly given but no documents to support the case is on record till date. As such, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice could be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the complainant. (As in the words of the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another***).

As such this court is of the view that it would be unfair and contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings which would tantamount to abuse of process of law in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties in respect of their dispute and to secure the ends of justice it would be prudent to quash the proceedings in the case as prayed for.

The revisional application being CRR 1619 of 2020 including CRAN 1/21 and CRAN 2/2023 is allowed.

Accordingly, the proceeding in connection with Domkal Police Station Case No. 54 of 2020 dated 02.02.2020 under Sections 420/406 of the Indian Penal Code corresponding G.R. No. 380/2020 pending before the learned Chief Judicial Magistrate, Murshidabad **is hereby quashed in respect of the petitioner namely Tarun Banerjee.**

All connected applications, if any, stand disposed of.

Interim order, if any, stands vacated.

Copy of this order be sent to the learned Trial Court for necessary compliance.

Urgent certified website copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied expeditiously after complying with all, necessary legal formalities.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)