



\$~20 & 122

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2383/2024**

SH. SONU AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ankit Gupta, Adv.
Petitioners in person

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Bhandari,
ASC for the State
Inspector Yunush, PS-
Ghazipur
R2 in person

122

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3152/2024**

MS PRIYANKA GAUTAM & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Manish Kumar, Adv.
Petitioners in person

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF
DELHI) & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V Khatri, ASC
for the State
Inspector Yunush, PS-
Ghazipur
R2 to R7 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

08.10.2024

**CRL.M.A. 23293/2024(for exemption) in W.P.(CRL)
2383/2024**

**CRL. M.A. 30546/2024 (for exemption) in W.P.(CRL)
3152/2024**

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. These applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 2383/2024 and CRL. M.A. 30547/2024 in



W.P.(CRL) 3152/2024 & W.P.(CRL) 3152/2024

3. The present petitions are filed seeking quashing of cross-FIRs, being, FIR No. 191/2017 dated 03.07.2017 for offences under Sections 323/448/452/506/427/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') and FIR No. 323/2017 dated 04.09.2017 for offences under Sections 323/354A/341/34 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Ghazipur, including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

4. FIR No. 191/2017 was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2 in W.P.(CRL) 2383/2024 [Petitioner No. 1 in W.P.(CRL) 3152/2024] alleging that the petitioners vandalised her office. It is alleged that thereafter upon seeing Respondent No. 2 in her Scorpio car, the petitioners also attempted to destroy her car by throwing bricks. Subsequently, it is alleged that once the glass of Respondent No. 2's car broke, the petitioners also attempted to hurt her.

5. FIR No. 323/2017 was registered alleging that Petitioner No. 1 in W.P.(CRL) 3152/2024 [Respondent No. 2 in W.P.(CRL) 2383/2024] along with the other petitioners entered the private Bahujan Samaj Party (BSP) office situated at the residence of Respondent Nos. 2-7 which is used as a party office, and forcibly broke the lock, and threw other items like chairs, tables, computers etcetera outside the office. It is alleged that thereafter an altercation took place between the parties.

6. The learned counsel for the parties submit that the altercation took place between the parties due to a misunderstanding and the dispute has since been resolved.

7. The present petitions are filed on the ground that the matters have amicably been settled between the parties by way of the Compromise Deed dated 27.07.2024, of their own free will,



without any threat, force, coercion, misrepresentation, or undue influence.

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

9. The petitioners unconditionally apologize for their behaviour and undertake not to indulge into any such activity in the future.

10. The parties are bound to the said undertaking.

11. The complainants, in the respective cases, on being asked, state that they do not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the respective FIRs registered by them, and they have no objection if the proceedings are quashed.

12. The parties are residents of same area. They submit that they have no remaining grievance and wish to live their lives peacefully in the future.

13. Offences under Sections 323/341/427/448/506 of the IPC are compoundable in nature whereas offence under Sections 354A/452 are non-compoundable in nature.

14. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') [erstwhile Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973] can quash offences which are non-compoundable 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)

15. 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)

16. In the present matters, the respective victims have stated that they do not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the respective FIRs. They have also stated that they are residents of same locality and have forgiven the accused persons. They wish to live harmoniously and peacefully in future. In the peculiar circumstances of these cases, it is unlikely that the present FIRs will result in conviction when the victims do not wish to pursue the cases. In such circumstances, continuation of the proceedings would only cause undue harassment and heartburn.

17. 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 opinion that this is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS.

18. In view of the above, FIR No. 191/2017 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject



to the payment of cost of ₹5,000/- by each petitioner (in W.P.(CRL.) 2383/2024), to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of twelve weeks from today.

19. Similarly, FIR No. 323/2017 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to the payment of a cost of ₹5,000/- by each petitioner (in W.P.(CRL.) 3152/2024), to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of twelve weeks from today.

20. Proof of deposit of cost be submitted to the concerned SHO.

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

22. All pending applications also stand disposed of.

23. A copy of the order be placed in both the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 8, 2024

“SS”