



2024:DHC:5473



\$~107

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 25.07.2024

+ CRL.M.C. 5676/2024

RAJ KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Leena Rampal, Ms. Trishla Anjali, Ms. Shivani Pandey, Ms. Jaismin Tanwar and Mr. Ranjeet, Advocates with Petitioner in-person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP for State with SI Mayank Istwal, PS: Kalyanpuri.

Mr. Sunil Sehrawat, Ms. Nidhi Dhull, Ms. Anshu Singhal, Ms. Mandvi Singh and Mr. Parmod Yadav, Advocates for R-2 with R-2-in-person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA

%

J U D G M E N TANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA, J (ORAL)

1. Petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr.P.C') has been preferred on behalf of the petitioner for quashing of FIR No. 0156/2017, under Sections 323/341/354/354(B)/506/509 IPC, registered at PS: Kalyanpuri.
2. Issue notice. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for respondent No. 2 along with respondent No. 2 appear on advance notice and accept notice.
3. In brief, as per the case of the prosecution, present FIR was registered on 20.05.2017, on complaint of respondent No. 2 (sister-in-law of petitioner), who alleged that on 19.05.2017, petitioner, who is her *devar*



(brother-in-law) abused and threatened her on the issue of property. She was assaulted and her clothes were also torn by the petitioner. Further complaint was not lodged by her on the date of incident, since she was in extreme pain.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that disputes between the parties erupted over inheritance of property, which have been amicably resolved in terms of MOU dated 05.07.2024. She further points out that petitioner has clean past antecedents and no previous involvements.

5. Learned APP for the State submits that in view of amicable settlement between the parties, he has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed.

6. Petitioner in the present case seeks to invoke the powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure. The same is to be used to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of Court. In which cases, the power to quash the criminal proceedings or the complaint or FIR may be used when the offender as well as victim have settled their dispute, would depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case and no generalized list or categories can be prescribed. However, the Court is required to give due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence and consider the impact on the society.

7. It may also be observed that heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot be appropriately quashed despite settlement. However, distinguished from serious offences, the offences which have predominant element of civil dispute or offences involving minor incidents, where the complainant / victim also stands compensated for loss, if any, stand on a different footing,



so far as exercise of inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is concerned. The High Court also is not foreclosed from examining as to whether there exists material for incorporation of such an offence or as to whether there is sufficient evidence which if proved would lead to proving the charge for the offence charged with. It may also be assessed, if in view of compromise between the parties, the possibility of conviction in such a case is remote and whether continuation of proceedings would cause grave oppression and prejudice the accused.

8. Petitioner and respondent No. 2 are present in person and have been identified by SI Mayank Istwal, PS: Kalyanpuri. I have interacted with the parties and they confirm that the matter has been amicably settled between them without any threat, pressure or coercion. Disputes primarily appear to have arisen on account of differences between the parties regarding inheritance of property. Respondent No. 2 submits that since all the disputes between the parties have been amicably settled, she has no further grievance in this regard and has no objection in case FIR in question is quashed.

9. Petitioner and respondents No. 2 intend to put quietus to the proceedings arising out over the issue of property. The settlement shall promote harmony between the parties and permit them to move forward in life. Also the chances of conviction are bleak in view of amicable settlement between the parties. Further, no past involvement of the petitioner has been brought to the notice of this Court.

10. Considering the facts and circumstances, since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties, no useful purpose shall be served by keeping the case pending. Continuation of proceedings would be nothing but an abuse of the process of Court. Consequently, FIR No. 0156/2017, under



2024:DHC:5473



Sections 323/341/354/354(B)/506/509 IPC, registered at PS: Kalyanpuri and proceedings emanating therefrom stand quashed.

11. In the facts and circumstances, instead of imposing the costs upon the petitioner, he is directed to plant 30 saplings of trees, which are upto 03 feet in height in the area of Kalyanpuri after getting in touch with the competent authority (i.e. Horticulture Department of MCD / DDA/ Conservator of Forests, Department of Forests & Wildlife, Govt. of NCT of Delhi) through IO / SHO, PS: Kalyanpuri. The photographs of planted saplings alongwith report of IO / SHO concerned shall be forwarded to this Court within eight weeks. Further, the upkeep of the saplings / trees shall be undertaken by the authorities concerned. In case of non compliance of directions for planting of trees, the petitioner shall be liable to deposit cost of Rs. 30,000/- with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority.

Petition is accordingly disposed of. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

A copy of this order be forwarded to learned Trial Court for information.

ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA, J.

JULY 25, 2024/R