



\$~106

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 9415/2024 & CRL.M.A. 36103/2024**

RAHUL KAPOOR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prag Chawla, Mr.
Ishaan Chawla, Mr.
Anubhav Gupta & Mr.
Harsit Khurana, Advs.
along with petitioner.

versus

STATE THROUGH SHO PS MOTI NAGAR WEST &
ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar
Chahar, APP for the State.
SI Mohit, PS Moti Nagar.
Mr. Shivajee Shukla, Adv.
for R-2 along with R-2 in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

02.12.2024

%

CRL.M.A. 36104/2024 (exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 9415/2024 & CRL.M.A. 36103/2024

3. The present petition is filed for quashing of FIR No. 1131/2022 dated 07.12.2022, for offence under Section 379 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC), registered at e-Police Station Moti Nagar, West.

4. The FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2 alleging that his property documents had been snatched from him near IIFL Branch, Moti Nagar between 14:40



and 14:45 on 30.11.2022.

5. Efforts were made to trace the accused persons, however, no clue was found in relation to the snatched documents. Thereafter, the complainant filed a monitoring application where he stated that the subject property had been sold by Respondent No.2 to Mrs. Sunita Taneja, who subsequently sold it to Mrs. Mukta Jain.

6. During the course of investigation, it was found that the documents snatched from Respondent No.2 had been deposited in the bank by Mrs. Mukta Jain to secure a loan, and she had received the same from the petitioner.

7. Chargesheet was filed under Sections 356/379/120B/34 of the IPC against the petitioner.

8. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have a long-standing acquaintance and the present FIR was registered due to some misunderstanding.

9. He submits that the petitioner had brokered the sale of the subject property from Respondent No.2 to Mrs. Sunita Taneja, who has been placed in column 12 of the chargesheet. He submits that the petitioner has further brokered the sale of the property from Mrs. Sunita Taneja to Mrs. Mukta Jain.

10. The present petition is filed on the ground that the parties have settled all the disputes and entered into a compromise deed dated 18.10.2024, on their own free will, without any coercion, pressure or undue influence.

11. Pursuant to the settlement, a sum of ₹2,50,000/- has already been paid to the complainant and the balance amount of ₹2,50,000/- has been paid today by way of DD No. 044658 dated 18.01.2024 drawn on Axis Bank Ltd., Branch Mayur Vihar, New Delhi.



12. The parties are present in person and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

13. Respondent No. 2, on being asked, states that he has settled the disputes and he does not have any objection if the proceedings are quashed.

14. Offence under Section 379 of the IPC is compoundable whereas offence under Section 356 of the IPC is non-compoundable.

15. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the Bhartiya 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)

16. 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 preserve 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)

17. The dispute between the parties seems to be predominantly civil in nature. In the present case, Respondent No.2 has stated that he 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.2 does not wish to pursue the case. In such circumstances, continuation of the proceedings would only cause undue harassment to Respondent No.2.

18. Keeping in view the nature of 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.

19. However, keeping in mind the fact that chargesheet has already been filed in the case arising out of FIR No. 1131/2022, and the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioner is put to cost.

20. In view of the above, FIR No.1131/2022 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of a total cost of ₹10,000/- by the petitioner, to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of eight weeks.

21. Proof of deposit of cost to be furnished to the concerned SHO.

22. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.

23. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 2, 2024

“SK”