



\$~77

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3119/2024, CRL.M.A. 12066/2024 &
CRL.M.A. 12067/2024

JAPASIS SINGH BINDRA Petitioner
Through: Ms. Chandrika Gupta,
Advocate alongwith
Petitioner-in-Person.

versus

THE STATE & ANR. Respondents
Through: Mr. Pradeep Gahalot, APP
for the State with Mr.
Mani Sur, Advocate.
Mr. Yash Gupta, Advocate
for R-2/Complainant.
SI Sakshi (P.S. Hari Nagar).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
24.04.2024

%

1. The present petition is filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') for quashing of FIR No. 334/2017 dated 08.08.2017 filed under Sections 279/338 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') and at Police Station Hari Nagar. The FIR was registered on a complaint filed by one Maninder Kaur, who is arrayed as Respondent No. 2 in the present petition.

2. The FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2.

3. It is averred that on 31.07.2017, when the Respondent No.2 was coming from work was hit by the petitioner who was

CRL.M.C. 3119/2024

Page 1 of 7



on a scooty. It is alleged that the Respondent No.2 sustained injuries.

4. The present petition is filed on the ground that the parties have already amicably settled the dispute and have entered into a settlement which was recorded in the order dated 28.04.2023 passed by the learned MACT Court, wherein the parties have stated that the matter is settled and requested to refer the case to Lok Adalat. In terms of settlement, a sum of ₹3,00,000/-, was to be paid as total settlement.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner states that the entire amount already stands paid to Respondent No. 2.

6. The parties are present in Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. Offence under Sections 279 of the IPC is non-compoundable and offence under Sections 338 of the IPC is compoundable.

8. The Respondent No.2 / injured is present in person and submits that he does not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the present FIR. He further submits that he is satisfied with the compensation received.

9. 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 the case of **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

CRL.M.C. 3119/2024

Page 2 of 7



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 Apex Court had 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. The present case relates to an offence under Section 279 of IPC wherein the Respondent No.2 sustained injuries due to the alleged rash and negligent act of the accused person. Thus, while deciding whether proceedings relating to such an offence can be quashed on the basis of the settlement between the accused and the victim, it is necessary to consider whether it is probable that the presented facts would constitute gross negligence and an element of *mens rea*, which is required for the purpose of conviction.

12. From the perusal of FIR and the documents annexed with the present petition, it appears to be a case of accident. It is not alleged that the petitioner was driving under the influence of alcohol or any other intoxicating substance. Given the fact that the complainant / injured has already settled with the petitioner, 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, Cr.P.C. can be exercised and the proceedings are quashed.

14. However, keeping in mind the fact that the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioner is put to cost.

15. In view of the above, FIR No. 334/2017 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of a sum of ₹10,000/- by the petitioner, to be deposited with Delhi Police Welfare Fund within a period of twelve weeks.

16. The petitioner is directed to submit the proof of payment of cost with the concerned SHO.

17. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.

18. All pending applications also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 24, 2024

'Aman'