

26.11.2024
Serial no. 2
Piya
Ct. No. 30

CRR 2461 of 2023
+
IA No.: CRAN 1 of 2024

Anita Devi & Ors.
vs.
State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Dhiraj Trivedi
Mr. Biresh Kr. Singh
Mr. Bankim Pal
..... for the Petitioners

Mr. Debasish Roy
Mr. Imran Ali
Ms. Debjani Sahu
... for the State

Ms. Pooja Sah
..... for the Opposite Party No. 2

1. The present revision has been preferred praying for quashing of charge sheet No.236/21 dated 02.12.2021 under Sections 498A, 406, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, arising out of Maniktala Police Station Case No.70 dated 17.04.2021 corresponding to G.R. 971 of 2021 pending before the Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate at Sealdah.
2. **CRAN 1 of 2024** filed, is a joint application on affidavit stating that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement in the present case and the

complainant/opposite party does not have any grievance if the proceedings in the present case is quashed.

3. The Applicants state that in view of the factual matrix of the instant case, the alleged disputes involved herein are essentially **private and personal** in nature arising out of **matrimonial dispute**, which does not involve any public interest, as such the proceedings in G.R. 971 of 2021 arising out of Maniktala Police Station Case No. 70 dated 17.04.2021 under Sections 498A, 406, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, pending before the Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate at Sealdah may be quashed as allowing the above proceedings to continue is not warranted in view of the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties.
4. The Applicants further state that true and proper appreciation of the Terms of Settlement entered between the Pankaj Agarwal and the opposite party No. 2 as per the mediation as well as other relevant materials on record, will unerringly indicate that allowing the impugned proceedings being G.R. 971 of 2021, arising out of Maniktala Police Station Case No. 70 dated 17.04.2021 under Sections 498A, 406, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, pending before the Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate at Sealdah will be in utter abuse of the process of law. It will be nothing but a formality because the Applicants have already entered into a settlement

thereby settling all disputes/differences and pursuant to the settlement, the proceedings in this case may be quashed in the interest of justice.

5. The Applicants state that in view of the amicable settlement arrived at by and between the parties, the Applicant No. 2 is ready and willing to withdraw all other cases filed by her against the other applicants/the accused persons.
6. The following rulings are relied upon by this Court considering the facts and circumstances of the case herein:-
 - (1) (2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases 303.
 - (2) (2018) 3 Supreme Court Cases 290.
7. 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.”

8. 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).*

9. **The joint application filed 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 criminal case being G.R. 971 of 2021, arising out of Maniktala Police Station Case No. 70 dated 17.04.2021 under Sections 498A, 406, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, pending before the Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate at Sealdah.
10. **From the materials on record**, it is clear that dispute in the present case is a **matrimonial dispute** and the parties have now resolved their entire dispute by way of a compromise/settlement on affidavit and as such the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put **the accused persons** to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice could be caused to them 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, (Supra))**.

11. 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.
12. **The revisional application being CRR 2461 of 2023 is thus allowed.**
13. The proceeding in G.R. 971 of 2021, arising out of Maniktala Police Station Case No.70 dated 17.04.2021 under Sections 498A, 406, 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 3 & 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, pending before the Learned Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate at Sealdah, **is hereby quashed in respect of the accused persons namely Binod Agarwal, Anita Devi, Baby Agarwal, Pankaj Agarwal & Rahul Agarwal (as in charge sheet).**
14. All connected Applications, if any, stands disposed of.
15. Interim order, if any, stands vacated.
16. Copy of this order be sent to the learned Trial Court for necessary compliance.
17. Urgent certified website copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied expeditiously after complying with all, necessary legal formalities.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)