



\$~132

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1497/2024**

**RENUKA GUSAIN**

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. K.P. Sharma & Mr. Tushar  
Talwar, Advocates.

versus

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

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for State  
with Inspector Mukesh Kumar, P.S.  
Cyber Outer.  
Ms. Shivangi Shokeen, Amicus  
Curiae along with R-2/Complainant  
in person.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE JYOTI SINGH**

**ORDER**

**23.02.2024**

%

**CRL.M.A. 5882/2024 (Exemption)**

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

**CRL.M.C. 1497/2024**

3. This petition has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.42/2022 dated 13.07.2022 under Sections 420/120B IPC registered at PS: Cyber Police Station Outer including proceedings emanating therefrom. Charge Sheet has been filed and Sections 419/468/471/34 IPC have been added.
4. As per the case of the prosecution, Complainant alleged that she created an ID on Jeevansathi.com in the month of June, 2022 wherefrom she



got to know Dr. Naresh Andrews who expressed his desire to know the Complainant for the purpose of marriage. When he came to India, he called the Complainant stating that he was caught at Mumbai Customs with expensive gifts such as mobiles, tablets and \$2,50,000. He had to pay Rs.35,000/- for his baggage and Rs.1,85,000/- for the other things that he was carrying. Complainant made payment of Rs.6,69,600/- from her account in Kotak Mahindra Bank and later realized that she had been cheated by the accused. During investigation, various bank instruments were recovered from the house of the Petitioner, the co-accused, which indicated that the money was being transferred into her accounts and she was involved in the fraudulent transactions and cheating the Complainant along with co-accused. Charge Sheet has been filed and the matter is pending trial. There are total 04 accused in the present case. One of the co-accused is in judicial custody and 02 have been declared as proclaimed offenders. Petitioner has been granted regular bail by this Court on 20.09.2023, pursuant to settlement between Petitioner and the Complainant before the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre.

5. Present petition has been filed predicated on a settlement between the Petitioner and the Complainant. It is stated that matter has been amicably resolved before the Samadhan, Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre and the terms of settlement have been incorporated in a Settlement Agreement dated 18.09.2023, copy of which has been placed on record. As per the terms of settlement, Petitioner agreed to pay a total amount of Rs.3,00,000/- to the Complainant in three equal installments of Rs.1,00,000/- each, as per the payment schedule mentioned in the Agreement.



6. Issue notice.
7. Learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.
8. Petitioner and Respondent no.2 are present and are identified by their respective counsels and Investigating Officer Mukesh Kumar, P.S. Cyber Outer. Respondent No.2 submits that as per the terms of settlement Rs.2,00,000/- had been paid to her before the filing of this petition and balance amount of Rs.1,00,000/- has been paid today and she has no objection to the quashing of the FIR qua the Petitioner herein. Learned APP for the State submits that since the Complainant has settled the matter with the Petitioner in this case FIR cannot be quashed qua the other accused and as far the Petitioner is concerned, the decision is left to the Court.
9. The Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Another, (2012) 10 SCC 303***, observed that while exercising inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. in respect of quashing of an FIR where parties have entered into amicable resolution of the disputes, one of the considerations would be whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue the criminal proceedings despite the compromise and if the answer to the question is in the affirmative, the High Court would be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings, in order to ensure that the disputes are put to an end and peace is restored as securing the ends of justice is the ultimate guiding factor. This was of-course with a caveat that heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, dacoity etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or the victim's family settles the disputes with the offender. Relevant paragraphs of the judgment are as follows:-

**“55.** *In the very nature of its constitution, it is the judicial obligation of*



*the High Court to undo a wrong in course of administration of justice or to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process. This is founded on the legal maxim quando lex aliquid alicui concedit, conceditur et id sine qua res ipsa esse non potest. The full import of which is whenever anything is authorised, and especially if, as a matter of duty, required to be done by law, it is found impossible to do that thing unless something else not authorised in express terms be also done, may also be done, then that something else will be supplied by necessary intendment. Ex debito justitiae is inbuilt in such exercise; the whole idea is to do real, complete and substantial justice for which it exists. The power possessed by the High Court under Section 482 of the Code is of wide amplitude but requires exercise with great caution and circumspection.*

xxx

xxx

xxx

**58.** *Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor. No doubt, crimes are acts which have harmful effect on the public and consist in wrongdoing that seriously endangers and threatens the well-being of the society and it is not safe to leave the crime-doer only because he and the victim have settled the dispute amicably or that the victim has been paid compensation, yet certain crimes have been made compoundable in law, with or without the permission of the court. In respect of serious offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc., or other offences of mental depravity under IPC or offences of moral turpitude under special statutes, like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, the settlement between the offender and the victim can have no legal sanction at all. However, certain offences which overwhelmingly and predominantly bear civil flavour having arisen out of civil, mercantile, commercial, financial, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony, particularly relating to dowry, etc. or the family dispute, where the wrong is basically to the victim and the offender and the victim have settled all disputes between them amicably, irrespective of the fact that such offences have not been made compoundable, the High Court may within the framework of its inherent power, quash the criminal proceeding or criminal complaint or FIR if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing the criminal proceedings, justice shall be casualty and ends of justice shall be defeated. The above list is illustrative and not exhaustive. Each case will depend on its own facts and no hard-and-fast category can be prescribed.*



xxx

xxx

xxx

**61.** *The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus : the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz. : (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding."*



10. Furthermore, the Supreme Court in ***Narinder Singh and Others v. State of Punjab and Another, (2014) 6 SCC 466***, reiterated the proposition and relevant paragraphs are as follows:-

*“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.”*

11. It is a settled law that inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. are required to be exercised to secure the ends of justice and/or prevent abuse of the process of the Court. The Supreme Court in the case of ***Nikhil Merchant v. Central Bureau of Investigation and Another, (2008) 9 SCC 677***, has observed that despite the ingredients and the factual content of an offence of



cheating punishable under Section 420 IPC, the same has been made compoundable under sub-section (2) of Section 320 Cr.P.C., with the leave of the Court. Co-ordinate Benches of this Court in ***Muddasir Khan And Ors. vs State and Others, in CRL M.C. 6024/2023 decided on 23.08.2023*** and ***Arun Kumar @ Arun Chauhan @ Ram and Ors. vs The State and Anr. (Nct of Delhi), in CRL M.C. 586/2020 decided on 10.12.2021***, have quashed FIRs under similar provisions predicated on amicable settlement between the parties.

12. From the conspectus of the aforesaid judgments, one of the principles that can be succinctly culled out for exercise of inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is that the inherent jurisdiction is to prevent abuse of process of Court or to secure ends of justice as ends of justice are higher than ends of mere law and inherent power has been vested in the High Court to do real, complete and substantial justice. This is of course not without a caveat that the Courts must steer clear of intervention in cases which involve heinous or serious offences involving mental depravity or economic offences and those which fall in the category of offences relating to murder, extortion, dacoity, cases under the Arms Act, 1959 etc.

13. Parties have mutually settled all their disputes before the Mediation Centre and terms of settlement have been complied with by the Petitioner. In view of the stand of Respondent No. 2 that she no longer wants to pursue the complaint, chances of conviction are remote and it would an abuse of process of law to continue with the criminal proceedings emanating from the present FIR qua the Petitioner herein.

14. Accordingly, the FIR No.42/2022 dated 13.07.2022 under Sections 420/120B IPC registered at PS: Cyber Police Station including the Charge



Sheet and proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed qua  
Petitioner herein.

15. Petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

**JYOTI SINGH, J**

**FEBRUARY 23, 2024/hs/shivam**