



\$~84 & 45

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

84

+ W.P.(CRL) 1487/2024
PAWAN @ BILLU AND ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Vinay Kumar Sharma,
Mr. Aaditya, Ms. Lata
Nautiyal, Ms. Pallavi, Mr.
Ankit Nautiyal, Ms.
Ayushi Yadav, Mr.
Dherender K. Nautiyal &
Mr. Akshay Nautiyal,
Advs.
Petitioners in person

Versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND
ANR & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V Khatri, ASC
for the State
SI Mamta & HC Desh Raj,
PS- Dabri
Mr. A.N. Aggarwal, Ms.
Nupur Sachdeva, Ms.
Hemlata Aggarwal & Ms.
Meenakshi, Advs. for R2
with R2 in person

45

+ CRL.M.C. 3662/2024
SANJAY UTREJA AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. A.N. Aggarwal, Ms.
Nupur Sachdeva, Ms.
Hemlata Aggarwal & Ms.
Meenakshi, Advs. with
petitioners in person

Versus

THE STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI)
AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh,
APP for the State with Mr.
Mukesh Rani, Mr. Mukesh
Dahiya & Ms. Neha,



Adv.
SI Mamta & HC Desh Raj,
PS- Dabri
R2 in person



CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

24.05.2024

CRL.M.A. 14032/2024 (for exemption) in CRL.M.C. 3662/2024

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

CRL.M.C. 3662/2024 & W.P.(CRL) 1487/2024

3. The present petitions are filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India and under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (**CrPC**) seeking quashing of cross-FIRs being FIR No. 1458/2015 dated 20.11.2015 registered at Police Station Dabri for offences under Sections 323/354/354(B)/427/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**'IPC'**) and FIR No. 195/2016 dated 20.02.2016 registered at Police Station Dabri for offences under Sections 354/506/509 of the IPC. Both the FIRs were registered on a complaint filed by Respondent No. 2 in the respective petitions.

4. It is alleged that the parties live in the same vicinity and due to certain financial transactions, a scuffle took place between the parties, which led to the registration of the cross FIRs.

5. The present petition is filed on the ground that with the intervention and efforts of well-wishers, friends and relatives, the parties have amicably settled all their disputes on their own will, and without any undue influence or duress, by way of Settlement



Deed dated 29.01.2024 in W.P.(CRL) 1487/2024, and by way of Memorandum of Understanding dated 05.03.2024 in CRL. M.C. 3662/2024. In terms of the settlement, the parties have agreed that they will approach and appear before this Court seeking quashing of cross-FIR Nos. 1458/2015 and 195/2016.

6. It is stated that the chargesheet in both FIRs has already been filed.

7. It is stated that the parties are neighbours and have decided to resolve all their disputes and live their future lives peacefully.

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

9. The parties state that they have resolved all their disputes and they have no objection if the proceedings arising out of the present FIRs are quashed.

10. Both the parties undertake not to indulge in any such activities in future.

11. The parties are bound down to the said undertaking.

12. Offences under Section 323/427/506/509 of the IPC are compoundable whereas offences under Sections 354/354(B) of the IPC are non-compoundable.

13. 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



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)

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

15. The Respondent No.2 / Complainants, in both the FIRs, have stated that they do not want to proceed with their respective complaints and it is also stated that the cross-FIRs were registered as an outcome of a financial dispute between the parties. It is further stated that the registration of the FIRs was an outcome of a misunderstanding. The parties are neighbours and have decided to live peacefully in future. In the peculiar circumstances of this case, it is unlikely that the present FIRs will result in a conviction when the complainants do not wish to pursue the cases arising out of the present FIRs and continuation of the proceedings would only cause ill will to fester between the parties and undue harassment to the complainants.

16. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and 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 continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of Court. I am of the opinion that this is a fit case to



exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC.

17. However, keeping in mind the fact that chargesheets have already been filed in both the FIRs and the State machinery has been put to motion, this Court feels that the ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

18. In view of the above, cross-FIRs being FIR No. 1458/2015 and FIR No. 195/2016 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of total cost of ₹40,000/-, out of which ₹20,000/- is to be paid by the petitioners in CRL.M.C. 3662/2024 and ₹20,000/- is to be paid by the petitioners in W.P.(CRL) 1487/2024. The said cost is to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of 16 weeks from today.

19. The present petitions are allowed in the aforesaid terms.

20. A copy of this order be placed in both the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MAY 24, 2024

“SS”