



\$~101

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 727/2024**

RAJ KUMAR CHAUHAN AND ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Gayatri Nandwani, Advocate
along with Petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for State
with SI Ramakant, P.S. Burari.
R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

30.01.2024

%

CRL.M.A. 2920/2024 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 727/2024 & CRL.M.A. 2919/2024 (stay)

3. This petition has been filed on behalf of the Petitioners under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No. 186/2013 dated 14.05.2013 under Sections 406/34 IPC and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 registered at PS: Burari including proceedings emanating therefrom.
4. At the outset, learned counsel for the Petitioners submits that Charge Sheet has been filed against the present Petitioners as well as against the husband of Petitioner No. 2 late Sh. Rai Singh Chauhan, who has, in the



meantime, expired on 31.01.2022. Copy of the death certificate has been annexed to the present petition.

5. As per the prosecution, marriage between Petitioner No.1 and daughter of Respondent No.2/Complainant was fixed, however, before the same could be actually solemnized, Petitioners started making demands of all kinds. Petitioners demanded cash, articles, box of sweets, etc. at almost every ceremony that was performed. The date for marriage was fixed as 30.11.2012 and soon after fixing the date, Petitioners started demanding furniture, electronic gadgets, motorcycle, jewellery and cash and threatened to call off the marriage if the demands were not met. When Respondent No.2 could not accept this position any longer, she called off the marriage and filed a complaint with the Police resulting in registration of the present FIR.

6. During the pendency of the criminal proceedings, however, parties amicably resolved all their disputes before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi and Settlement Agreement dated 19.10.2023 was executed, incorporating the settlement terms. Copy of the Settlement Agreement has been filed with the petition. As per one of the terms of settlement, Petitioners agreed to pay a sum of Rs.40,000/- to Respondent No.2, out of which Rs.20,000/- has been paid and balance was payable at the time of quashing of the FIR.

7. Issue notice.

8. Learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.

9. Petitioners are present in Court and are identified by their respective counsel as well as Investigating Officer SI Ramakant, P.S. Burari. Respondent No. 2 is present in Court and is identified by the IO. Respondent



No.2 acknowledges having received the balance amount of Rs.20,000/- in Court and submits that she has no objection to the FIR being quashed as all disputes have been amicably settled with the Petitioners.

10. The Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Another, (2012) 10 SCC 303***, observed that while exercising inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. in respect of quashing of an FIR where parties have entered into amicable resolution of the disputes, one of the considerations would be whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue the criminal proceedings despite the compromise and if the answer to the question is in the affirmative, the High Court would be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings, in order to ensure that the disputes are put to an end and peace is restored as securing the ends of justice is the ultimate guiding factor. This was of-course with a caveat that heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, dacoity etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or the victim's family settles the disputes with the offender. Relevant paragraphs of the judgment are as follows:-

“55. In the very nature of its constitution, it is the judicial obligation of the High Court to undo a wrong in course of administration of justice or to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process. This is founded on the legal maxim quando lex aliquid alicui concedit, conceditur et id sine qua res ipsa esse non potest. The full import of which is whenever anything is authorised, and especially if, as a matter of duty, required to be done by law, it is found impossible to do that thing unless something else not authorised in express terms be also done, may also be done, then that something else will be supplied by necessary intendment. Ex debito justitiae is inbuilt in such exercise; the whole idea is to do real, complete and substantial justice for which it exists. The power possessed by the High Court under Section 482 of the Code is of wide amplitude but requires exercise with great caution and circumspection.

xxx

xxx

xxx

58. Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having



regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor. 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.

xxx

xxx

xxx

61. *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.”

11. Parties have mutually settled all their disputes. Settlement amount has been paid to Respondent No. 2. In view of the settlement between the parties and the categorical stand of Respondent No.2 that she does not want to pursue the complaint, no useful purpose will be achieved in continuing the criminal proceedings emanating from the subject FIR as the chances of conviction are bleak and it would be in the interest of justice that the proceedings are terminated and peace and harmony established between the parties, continues. This Court is fortified in its view by the judgments of this



Court in *Nasiruddin @ Nasir & Anr. v. State of NCT Delhi & Anr.*, *CRL.M.C. 8996/2023* decided on 08.12.2023 and *Sonu and Ors. v. State and Ors.*, *CRL.M.C. 1351/2019* decided on 13.03.2019, where the Courts have quashed FIRs under similar provisions, predicated on settlement between the parties, in the interest of justice. Accordingly, FIR No. 186/2013 dated 14.05.2013 under Sections 406/34 IPC and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 registered at PS: Burari is quashed including proceedings emanating therefrom.

12. Petition stands allowed and disposed of. Pending application stands disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

JANUARY 30, 2024/kks