



\$~80

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1186/2024**

GULSHAN KUMAR GIRI Petitioner

Through: Adv. S.K. Giri along with
petitioner.

versus

THE STATE N.C.T. OF DELHI AND ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari
(Advocate), ASC (Crl)
along with Adv. Anvita
Bhandari, Adv. Kunal
Mittal, Adv. Arjit Sharma
& Adv. Vaibhav Vats.
Adv. B.N. Sharma for R-2
& R-3 along with R-2 &
R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **16.04.2024**

CRL.M.A. 11461/2024 (*exemption filing certified copy of the
annexures*)

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

W.P.(CRL) 1186/2024

3. The present petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (**CrPC**) seeking quashing of FIR No. 400/2017 dated 19.09.2017, for offence under Section 363 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**IPC**), registered at Police Station Hari Nagar. The FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No.2.

4. The FIR was registered on a complaint alleging that on

W.P.(CRL) 1186/2024

Page 1 of 7



17.09.2017, when Respondent No. 2 came home, his younger daughter / Respondent No.3 was missing.

5. It is stated that the petitioner and Respondent No. 3 were in a romantic relationship. On 17.09.2017, Respondent No. 3 left her home on her own will and consent, and at that time, Respondent No. 3 was a minor girl aged 17 years.

6. The learned counsel for the parties submit that the daughter of Respondent No. 2 had left the custody of her father on her own will. He submits that she subsequently married the petitioner on attaining the age of majority and out of the said wedlock, the petitioner and the daughter of Respondent No. 2 also have two children. Respondent No. 2 has since accepted the relationship of his daughter and does not wish to pursue the present proceedings.

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

8. Respondent No. 2 is present in Court and states that he does not wish to pursue any proceedings arising out of the present FIR. He has since accepted the petitioner as his son in law and does not have any grievance.

9. Offence under Section 363 IPC is non-compoundable.

10. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 482 of the CrPC can compound offences 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 :-

W.P.(CRL) 1186/2024

Page 2 of 7



“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. It is not in dispute that the offence under Section 363 of the IPC is heinous in nature and cannot be termed as an offence *in personam*. However, the allegations in the present case were made by the father of a girl, who was almost aged 18 years, that she had been missing.

13. As noted above, Respondent No.3 had left the custody of Respondent No.2, that is, her father, on her own will and in such circumstances, the offence punishable under Section 363 of the IPC is not made out. Respondent No.3 has thereafter also married the accused petitioner. Respondent No.2 has also accepted their relationship. In these circumstances, keeping the dispute alive would be an abuse of the process of the Court and would only cause harassment and torture to the parties.

14. Thus, keeping in view the principle as noted above and the fact that Respondent No. 2 does not wish to pursue any proceedings arising out of the present FIR and has since accepted
W.P.(CRL) 1186/2024

Page 6 of 7



the petitioner as his son-in-law, I am of the opinion that it is a fit case where discretionary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC can be exercised and the proceedings are quashed.

15. In view of the above, the FIR No.400/2017 and all consequential proceedings are, therefore, quashed.

16. The petition is allowed in aforementioned terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 16, 2024

"SK"