



* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 2678/2024**

AMAN CHOPRA & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Ankush Bhardwaj &
Mr. Sandeep Kataria,
Advocates. P4 (through
V.C.).

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri,
ASC-CRL for the State.
SI Meetu Yadav & SI
Khushboo (P.S. G.K.-I).
Mr. Nikhil Rohatgi, Mr.
Sagar Suri, Mr. Shashank
Khurana, Mr. Shubham
Gupta & Mr. Kabir Sagar
Ghosh, Advocates for
R3/Complainant
alongwith R3 in person.

85
+ **W.P.(CRL) 2681/2024**

DEVENDRA SINGH PATNIPetitioner
Through: Mr. Manish Kumar, Mr.
Piyush Kaushik & Ms.
Aparajita Jha, Advocates
(Through V.C.) alongwith
Petitioner-in-Person.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI). & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri,
ASC-CRL for the State.
SI Meetu Yadav & SI
Khushboo (P.S. G.K.-I).
Mr. Nikhil Rohatgi, Mr.
Sagar Suri, Mr. Shashank
Khurana, Mr. Shubham



Gupta & Mr. Navir Sagar
Ghosh, Advocates for R-3
alongwith R-3-in-Person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
02.09.2024

%

CRL.M.A. 26338/2024 in W.P.(CRL) 2678/2024 & CRL.M.A. 26341/2024 in W.P.(CRL) 2681/2024 (exemption from filing certified copies of annexures)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 2678/2024 & W.P.(CRL) 2681/2024

3. The present petitions are filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') read with Article 226 of the Constitution of India seeking quashing of FIR No. 269/2024 dated 11.07.2024, registered at Police Station Greater Kailash, for offences punishable under Sections 354/323/341/509/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'), including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. The said FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No.3.

4. It is averred that the complainant is the employee of one Sagar Suri, who is the neighbour of the petitioners. It is alleged that when Respondent No.3 had gone to the basement for repairing of the water tank, the accused persons restrained her and gave her beatings. It is further alleged that the petitioners misbehaved with the complainant and snatched her gold chain and *mangalsutra* as well. The incident led to the registration of the FIR.

5. W.P.(CRL) 2678/2024 has been filed by five of the



accused persons and W.P.(CRL) 2681/2024 has been filed by accused Devendra separately seeking the same relief.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners and the employer of Respondent No.3 are neighbours who reside on different floors of the same property. They submit that the neighbours and their employees are embroiled in multiple litigations over disputes in relation to the same.

7. This Court, in common order dated 16.07.2024, passed in W.P.(CRL) 2067/2024 and W.P.(CRL) 2069/2024 (*filed in relation to other disputes between the neighbours*), had noted the submission of Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for the State, that he would personally make an endeavour to mediate the dispute and get the matter amicably resolved.

8. Pursuant to the same, the present petition is filed on the ground that the matter is amicably settled between the parties, with the intervention of Mr. Sanjay Lao, the learned Standing Counsel, on their own free will, without any threat, force, coercion or misrepresentation. It is also pointed out that the neighbours have also amicably entered into a settlement dated 05.08.2024 wherein it has been agreed that appropriate steps will be taken for quashing of the multiple FIRs registered by them against each other.

9. Respondent No.3 and the petitioner Devendra are present in person in Court. Petitioner No. 4 in W.P.(CRL.) 2678/2024 is present through video conference. The parties have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

10. Respondent No.3/complainant, on being asked, states that she has no remaining grievance against the accused persons. She states that she does not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the present FIR, and has no objection if the proceedings are quashed.



11. Offences under Sections 323/341/509 of the IPC are compoundable in nature whereas offence under Section 354 of the IPC is non-compoundable in nature.

12. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the 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 ***Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr. : (2014) 6 SCC 466***, the Hon'ble Apex 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)

13. Similarly, in ***Parbatbhai Aahir & Ors v. State of Gujarat & Anr. : (2017) 9 SCC 641***, the Hon'ble Apex 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)

14. It is stated that the dispute arose due to some issues between the petitioners and the employer of Respondent No.3. It is stated that the issues have led to a multiplicity of proceedings and multiple FIRs have been registered by the neighbours and their employees against each other. All the disputes have since been resolved. In the present case, Respondent No.3 has stated that she has no remaining grievance and she does not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the present FIR. In the peculiar circumstances of this case, it is unlikely that the present FIR will result in a conviction when Respondent No.3 does not wish to pursue the case. In such circumstances, this Court is of the opinion that the pendency of the proceedings would be an abuse of the process of the Court and only cause harassment and heartburn.

15. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and that the parties have amicably settled the dispute, 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.

16. In view of the above, FIR No. 269/2024 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.



17. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.
18. A copy of the order be placed in both the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 2, 2024

'Aman'