



\$~13 & 14

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2417/2024

DAYANAND SAGAR @ UDAY
& ORS

..... Petitioners
Through: Petitioners in person

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI
& ANR.

..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Pradeep Gahalot, APP
for the State with Ms.
Anuranjan Arya, Adv.
SI Meena & Inspector
Rani Kumar, PS- Mauray
Enclave
Mr. R.R. Raju, Adv. For
R2 with R2 in person

+ CRL.M.C. 2419/2024

RATISH RAJ & ORS.

..... Petitioners
Through: Mr. R.R. Raju, Adv. With
petitioners in person

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI
& ANR.

..... Respondents
Through: Mr. Pradeep Gahalot, APP
for the State with Ms.
Anuranjan Arya, Adv.
SI Meena & Inspector
Rani Kumar, PS- Mauray
Enclave
R2 in person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
04.04.2024

%



CRL.M.A. 9244/2024 (for exemption) in CRL.M.C. 2417/2024
CRL.M.A. 9251/2024 (for exemption) in CRL.M.C. 2419/2024

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

CRL.M.C. 2417/2024 & CRL.M.A. 9245/2024 (for condonation of delay) in CRL.M.C. 2417/2024
CRL.M.C. 2419/2024 & CRL.M.A. 9252/2024 (for condonation of delay) in CRL.M.C. 2419/2024

3. The present petitions are filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') seeking quashing of FIR No. 527/2016, for offences under Sections 354/509/323/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'), and also FIR No. 528/2016, for offences under Sections 354/354(B)/506/509/34 of the IPC, both dated 24.10.2016, registered at Police Station Maurya Enclave, including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. Charge sheet has been filed in both the cases.
4. It is averred that due to some misunderstanding and miscommunication, a scuffle took place between the parties, who are relatives, which led to the filing of the cross-FIR Nos. 527/2016 and 528/2016.
5. The present petition is filed on the ground that with the intervention and efforts of well-wishers, friends and relatives, the parties have amicably settled all their disputes on their own will, and without any undue influence or duress, by way of Memorandum of Understanding dated 03.04.2023.
6. In terms of the Memorandum of Understanding, the parties have agreed that they will approach this Court for quashing of cross-FIR Nos. 527/2016 and 528/2016.
7. The parties are present in person and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.
8. The parties are related to each other and state that they



have resolved all their disputes and they have no objection if the proceedings arising out of the present cross-FIRs are quashed.

9. The parties undertake to live harmoniously in the future, and to not indulge in any such activities.

10. The complainants in both the cases, on being asked, state that they do not wish to pursue the proceedings out of the respective FIRs. They submit that the FIRs were registered due to some personal misunderstanding and there is no remaining grievance between the parties now. They submit continuation of the proceedings will only cause undue harassment and heart burn.

11. Offences under Sections 323/506/509 of the IPC are compoundable whereas offences under Sections 354/354B of the IPC are non-compoundable.

12. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 482 of the CrPC can compound offences which are non-compoundable under the Code 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)

13. 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)

14. It is pertinent to note that the parties are relatives and have amicably settled the disputes. They have decided to live harmoniously and in peace. The continuation of the proceedings, in such circumstances, would serve no purpose and only cause harassment to the complainants and heart burn.

15. Keeping in view the nature of the dispute and that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, this Court feels that 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 482 of the CrPC.

16. However, keeping in mind the fact that the charge sheets have already been filed in both cases arising out of cross-FIR Nos. 527/2016 and 528/2016, and the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

17. In view of the above, FIR No. 527/2016 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of a cost of ₹5,000/- by each of the petitioners in CRL.M.C. 2419/2024, to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Fund, within a period of eight weeks from date.

18. Similarly, FIR No. 528/2016 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of



a cost of ₹5,000/- by each of the petitioners in CRL.M.C. 2417/2024, to be deposited with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee, within a period of eight weeks from date.

19. The present petitions are allowed in the aforesaid terms.
20. All pending applications also stand disposed of.
21. A copy of this order be placed in both the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

APRIL 4, 2024
“SS”