



\$~93

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 564/2024**

BEENA CHAUHAN @MEENA AND ORS. Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sushant Mukund, Mr. Chaman Kumar and Mr. Deepak Dagar, Advocates with Petitioners in person.

versus

STATE (GNCT OF DELHI) AND ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for State with SI Manish, PS: Welcome.

Mohd. Shamikh, Advocate for R-2 with R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH

ORDER

%

19.02.2024

CRL.M.A. 5184/2024 (Exemption)

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

W.P. (CRL) 564/2024

3. This petition has been filed on behalf of the Petitioners under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No. 183/2019 dated 29.03.2019 under Sections 420/468/34 IPC registered at PS: Welcome, including proceedings emanating therefrom.
4. According to the Petitioners, the present FIR has its genesis in a property disputes between the Petitioners and the Complainant apart from disputes relating to monetary transactions. A civil suit being CS No. 2/2019 seeking mandatory injunction was filed by Petitioner No. 1 against Respondent No. 2 and his son Fazil titled '*Beena Chauhan v. Mohd. Shahid*



and Anr.’ before Karkardooma Courts, Delhi and a recovery suit being CS No. 126/2019 was filed by Respondent No. 2 against the Petitioners titled *‘Mohd. Shahid v. Smt. Beena Chauhan & Ors.’*. Present FIR was registered on the directions of learned MM, on an application filed by the Complainant under Section 156(3) Cr.P.C. read with Section 200 Cr.P.C. as a pressure tactics to resolve the civil disputes.

5. It is further stated in the petition that parties have resolved all their disputes and a Settlement Agreement has been executed on 04.12.2023 before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi. Copy of the Settlement Agreement has been annexed to the petition. It was agreed that out of total settled amount of Rs.10,50,000/-, Petitioners No. 1 to 3 shall jointly pay Rs.10,00,000/- only to Respondent No. 2 and Petitioner No. 4 shall pay Rs.50,000/- to Respondent No. 2. In compliance of the settlement, a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- has already been paid to Respondent No. 2 by Petitioners No. 1 to 3 jointly by way of Demand Draft No. 018879 dated 06.12.2023. Petitioner No. 4 has paid Rs.50,000/- in cash to Respondent No. 2 on 14.02.2024. Balance amount of Rs.4,00,000/- was payable at the time of quashing of the FIR. All parties have withdrawn their respective civil suits from the Courts where they were pending.

6. Issue notice.

7. Learned Standing Counsel accepts notice on behalf of the State.

8. Mohd. Shamikh, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of Respondent No.2.

9. Petitioners and Respondent No. 2 are present and are identified by the Investigating Officer SI Manish, PS: Welcome. Respondent No. 2 acknowledges the receipt of balance amount of Rs.4,00,000/- in Court today



by way of Demand Draft bearing No.018985 dated 13.02.2024 drawn on HDFC Bank, copy of which is filed along with the petition. Respondent No. 2 states that he has no objection to the FIR being quashed as the disputes between the parties have been amicably settled. Learned Standing Counsel has no objection to the quashing of the FIR, in view of the settlement between the parties and an affidavit of 'No Objection' filed by Respondent No. 2 in support of this petition.

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. In a later judgment in the case of ***Narinder Singh and Others v. State of Punjab and Another***, (2014) 6 SCC 466, the Supreme Court reiterated the proposition and relevant paragraphs are as follows:-

“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.”

12. Parties have mutually settled all their disputes. Settlement amount has been paid to Respondent No. 2, who has made a categorical statement that she does not wish to pursue the complaint. In these facts and circumstances, the chances of conviction are remote and it would be in the interest of justice to terminate the criminal proceedings. This Court is fortified in its view by the judgments of the Co-ordinate Benches of this Court in ***Sushil Kumar and Ors. v. The State of Delhi NCT & Ors., CRL.M.C. 6349/2023*** decided on 21.09.2023 and ***Neetu Sharma & Anr. v. State NCT of Delhi & Ors., CRL.M.C. 2425/2021*** dated 20.12.2021, where in similar circumstances of



settlement, FIRs under similar provisions were quashed in the interest of justice.

13. Accordingly, FIR No. 183/2019 dated 29.03.2019 under Sections 420/468/34 IPC registered at PS: Welcome is quashed including proceedings emanating therefrom.

14. Petition stands allowed and disposed of.

JYOTI SINGH, J

FEBRUARY 19, 2024/shivam