



\$~66

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 2910/2024**

BHUVESH PASRICHA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Hemant Kumar, Adv.
along with petitioner.

versus

**THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)
THROUGH THE SHO, P.S. CONNAUGHT PLACE
DELHI**

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for
the State.

Mr. Peeyush Ranjan, Mr.
Arun Chaurasiya, Mr.
Utkarsh Singh, Mr. Varun
Mor, Advs. for R-2 along
with R-2 in person.

SI Gajender Singh, PS
Connaught Place.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

10.04.2024

CRL.M.A. 11107/2024 (*exemption filing certified copy of the
annexures and fair typed copy of dim and less margin annexures*)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 2910/2024

3. The present petition is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (**CrPC**) seeking quashing of FIR No. 218/2021 dated 28.11.2021, under Sections 279/337 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**IPC**), registered at Police Station Connaught Place. The FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2. The chargesheet has already been filed in the present FIR.

CRL.M.C. 2910/2024

Page 1 of 7



4. It is alleged that on 18.11.2021, a DD entry was assigned to Assistant Sub-Inspector Dalbir Singh. The caller stated that two persons were found injured at Tolstoy Marg and they were taken to Lady Hardinge Hospital. A car bearing NO. HR-26DF-2252 XUV-500 Mohindra was found at the spot in accidental condition. Thereafter, ASI Dalbir Singh reached at Lady Hardinge Hospital where he found two injured namely, Rajiv Ranjan (Respondent No.2) and Ramod. Injured Rajiv Ranjan was declared unfit for statement whereas other injured Ramod was declared fit for statement, but he refused to give any statement.

5. The present petition has been filed on the ground that the parties have, by way of Settlement Deed dated 06.04.2024, settled their dispute by mutual consent and without any influence or pressure. As per the Settlement Deed dated 06.04.2024, the petitioner has already paid all the medical expenses to Respondent No. 2 and the MACT case has already been settled, Respondent No. 2 has no objection, if the present FIR is quashed.

6. The Petitioner and Respondent No. 2 are present in Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. Respondent No. 2, who is present in Court, submits that he has no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

8. The allegations made in the FIR do not point out towards any cognizable offence under Sections 279/337. The FIR only records that the victims were injured due to accident. There were no allegations that the accident occurred due to rash and negligent driving.

9. Offence under Section 279 IPC is non-compoundable whereas offence under Section 337 of IPC is compoundable.

10. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 482 of the CrPC can compound offences
CRL.M.C. 2910/2024

Page 2 of 7



which are non-compoundable under the Code 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 High Court while accepting settlement and quashing the proceedings. In ***Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr. : (2014) 6 SCC 466***, the Hon'ble Apex Court has 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)

11. Similarly, in ***Parbatbhai Aahir & Ors v. State of Gujarat & Anr.***: (2017) 9 SCC 641, the Hon’ble Apex 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)

12. From the perusal of FIR and the documents annexed with the present petition, it appears to be a case of accident where simple injuries were suffered by the complainant. Given the fact that the dispute has been settled between the petitioner and Respondent No. 2 and the petitioner has paid all medical expenses to Respondent No. 2, it would be improbable to secure a conviction in the facts of the present case.

13. Keeping in view the aforesaid principle and the nature of



dispute and the fact that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the dispute alive and it is a fit case where discretionary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC can be exercised and the proceedings are quashed.

14. In view of the above, the FIR No. 218/2021 and all consequential proceedings are, therefore, quashed.

15. The petition is allowed in aforementioned terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 10, 2024

"SK"