



\$~92 to 94

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 423/2024 & CRL.M.A. 1665/2024**

KASMIR THOMAS Petitioner
Through: Mr. Tanveer Ahmed Mir
& Mr. Vaibhav Suri,
Advs.
Petitioner in person

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR. Respondents
Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the
State
ACP Dharmendra Kumar
Singh, DIV/NDD
Mr. Faisal Mohd., Adv. for
Respondent No. 2 with
Respondent No. 2 in
person

+ **CRL.M.C. 424/2024 & CRL.M.A. 1666/2024**

SYED MOHAMMED IMRAN Petitioner
Through: Mr. Tanveer Ahmed Mir
& Mr. Vaibhav Suri,
Advs.
Petitioner in person

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR. Respondents
Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the
State
ACP Dharmendra Kumar
Singh, DIV/NDD
Mr. Faisal Mohd., Adv. for
Respondent No. 2 with
Respondent No. 2 in
person

+ **CRL.M.C. 425/2024 & CRL.M.A. 1667/2024**

NANDITA KUMAR Petitioner

CRL.M.C. 423/2024 & connected matters

Page 1 of 7



Mr. Tanveer Ahmed Mir
& Mr. Vaibhav Suri,
Advs.
Petitioner in person



versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR. Respondents
Through: Mr. Utkarsh, APP for the
State
ACP Dharmendra Kumar
Singh, DIV/NDD
Mr. Faisal Mohd., Adv. for
Respondent No. 2 with
Respondent No. 2 in
person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
18.01.2024

%

1. The present petitions are filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (**CrPC**) seeking quashing of FIR No. 129/2016 dated 01.08.2016, registered at Police Station Barakhamba Road for offences punishable under Sections 380/403/420/120B/201 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**IPC**) and Section 66 of the Information Technology Act, 2000, including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.
2. The present FIR was registered at the instance of the complainant/Respondent No.2 alleging that the petitioners, in conspiracy with each other had stolen several precious articles and property documents pertaining to one, Nainital property from the house of the complainant. It is alleged that on the intervening night of 03.05.2015-04.05.2015, when the complainant confronted Syed Mohammad Imran about his changed behaviour, he tried to choke her to death. It is further alleged that in the

CRL.M.C. 423/2024 & connected matters

Page 2 of 7



latter half of the year 2015, Syed Mohammad Imran destroyed the electronic record of conversations between himself and Nandita Kumar, stored in the MacBook of the complainant.

3. The chargesheet in the present case has already been filed against the petitioners namely, Kashmir Thomas and Syed Mohammed Imran however, the investigation was kept pending against the petitioner namely, Nandita Kumar.

4. The present petitions are filed on the ground that the parties have amicably settled all their disputes by way of a Settlement Agreement dated 23.07.2022, executed on their own free will without any coercion, pressure, or undue influence.

5. In terms of the Settlement Agreement dated 23.07.2022, out of the lumpsum settlement amount of ₹3,52,00,000/- (Rupees Three Crores and Fifty-Two Lakhs Only), the sum of ₹2,42,00,000/- (Rupees Two Crores and Forty-Two Lakhs Only) already stands paid to Respondent No. 2, and the balance settlement amount of ₹1,10,00,000/- (One Crore and Ten Lakhs Only) is handed over to Respondent No.2 in Court today by way of Demand Draft No. 504000, dated 12.01.2024, drawn on ICICI Bank, Delhi Overseas.

6. The learned counsel for the parties submits that all the terms of the said settlement have been complied with.

7. The petitioners and Respondent No. 2 are present before this Court in person. The parties have been duly identified by their respective Counsel and Investigating Officer.

8. Offences under Sections 380/201 of the IPC and Section 66 of the Information Technology Act, 2000 are non-compoundable whereas offences under Sections 403/420 of the IPC are compoundable.

9. It is well settled that the High Courts while exercising



powers under Section 482 of the CrPC, can compound offences which are non-compoundable under the CrPC on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant. The Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down parameters and guidelines for the High Courts while accepting settlements and quashing the proceedings. In **Narinder Singh & Ors. V. State of Punjab & Anr. : (2014) 6 SCC 466**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had observed as under:-

“29. 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:

29.1. Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

- (i) ends of justice, or*
- (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.*

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that



capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly 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.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.”

(emphasis supplied)

10. Similarly, in the case of **Parbatbhai Aahir & Ors v. State of Gujarat & Anr.: (2017) 9 SCC 641**, the Hon’ble Supreme Court has observed as under :-

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must



evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. **Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.**

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the



State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”

(emphasis supplied)

11. Keeping in view the nature of the dispute and that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, this Court feels that no purpose would be served by keeping the dispute alive and continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of Court. I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC.

12. The FIR was registered way back in the year 2016. Keeping in mind the fact that the charge sheet has already been filed in the case arising out of FIR No. 129/2016, and the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the parties are put to cost.

13. In view of the above, FIR No. 129/2016 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of cost for a sum of ₹25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only) by each of the petitioner, to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Fund within a period of four weeks.

14. The present petition along with the pending application(s) is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 18, 2024 /“SS”

CRL.M.C. 423/2024 & connected matters

Page 7 of 7