



\$~16 & 17

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 5224/2024**

RITESH TEWARI & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kalia and Mr.
Sunny Sharma, Advs.
P-1 & P-2 in person.
P-3 (through VC)

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI
& ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Naresh Kumar Chahar,
APP for the State with SI
Shubhangi, PS B.K. Road.
Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv. for
R-2.
R-2 / complainant in
person.

+ **CRL.M.C. 5227/2024**

INDERJEET SINGH YADAV & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Amit Kumar, Adv.
P-2, 4 & 5 in person.
P-1, 3 & 6 (through VC).

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)
& ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Naresh Kumar Chahar,
APP for the State with SI
Tarun Kumar, PS Civil
Lines.
R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

04.11.2024

1. The present petitions are filed seeking quashing of FIR
Nos. 78/2017 dated 20.05.2017, registered at Police Station



Barakhamba Road, for offences under Sections 419/420/400/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('**IPC**') and FIR No. 199/2012 dated 27.11.2012, registered at Police Station Civil Lines, for offences under Sections 34/342/384/451/506/511 of the IPC and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom in the respective FIRs.

2. FIR No. 78/2017 was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 5224/2024 (Petitioner No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 5227/2024) alleging that the petitioners duped him into paying over a sum of ₹70 lakhs on the false pretext of getting him a Power supply tender. It is alleged that despite multiple requests, the petitioners failed to return the aforesaid sum to Respondent No. 2 which culminated into the registration of the subject FIR. Charge sheet in this case has been filed under Sections 406/419/420/34 of the IPC.

3. FIR No. 199/2012 was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 5227/2024 (Petitioner No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 5224/2024). It is alleged that on 25.11.2012, the petitioners had gone to the office of the elder brother of Respondent No. 2, and had threatened him of dire consequences should Respondent No. 2 fail to pay a sum of ₹10 crore to the petitioners. Charge sheet in this case has been filed under Sections 451/506/385/34 of the IPC.

4. The present petitions are filed on the ground that the parties have amicably settled all their disputes with the intervention of their respective family members and friends, of their own free will without any fear, force or coercion.

5. The petitions are supported by the duly sworn affidavits / No Objection Certificates of the respective Respondent No. 2 in



each case.

6. In regard to CRL.M.C. 5224/2024, Petitioner Nos. 1 & 2 and Respondent No. 2 are present in person in Court whereas Petitioner No. 3 has joined the proceedings through video-conferencing. In regard to CRL.M.C. 5227/2024, Petitioner Nos. 2, 4 & 5 and Respondent No. 2 are present in person in Court whereas Petitioner Nos. 1, 3 & 6 have joined the proceedings through video conferencing. The parties in both the petitions have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. On being asked, Respondent Nos. 2 / complainant in the respective petitions, state that they do not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the respective FIRs registered on the complaint(s) filed by them, and they have no objection if the proceedings arising out of the respective FIRs are quashed.

8. Offences under Sections 406/419/420/451/506 of the IPC are compoundable whereas offence under Section 385 of the IPC is non-compoundable.

9. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (**CrPC**), can compound offences which are non-compoundable under the CrPC 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 Courts exercising jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC for quashing of proceedings on the ground of settlement. In the case of **Narinder Singh & Ors. V. State of Punjab & Anr. : (2014) 6 SCC 466**, the Hon'ble Supreme 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)

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



11. Keeping in view the nature of the 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 considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 482 of CrPC.

12. However, keeping in mind the fact that the charge sheets have already been filed in the cases arising out of the present FIRs, and the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

13. In view of the above, FIR No. 78/2017 and FIR No. 199/2012 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of total cost of ₹30,000/- by the petitioners in each petition (₹10,000/- by each petitioner in CRL.M.C. 5224/2024, and ₹5,000/- by each petitioner in CRL.M.C. 5227/2024), to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of eight weeks from date.

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

15. Let the proof of deposit of cost be submitted with the concerned SHO / IO.

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

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 4, 2024

'KDK'