



\$~63

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 221/2025**

BHOPAL DUTT ALIAS BHUPAL DUTT & ORS.Petitioners

Through: **Mr. Shivendra Singh and Ms. Prakriti Rastogi, Advocates.**

versus

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

Through: **Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP for State with Mr. Deepak Kumar, SI, PS-Burari.
Mr. S.N. Shukla and Mr. A.K. Jha, Advocates for R-2.**

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

ORDER

% **05.03.2025**

1. The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of the proceedings in CR Case No. 3591/2019 titled “*State v. Bhupal Dutt & Ors.*” arising out of FIR No. 132/2018 dated 26th March, 2018, registered at P.S. Burari for offences under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860,¹ as well as all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom. This request is made in light of the amicable settlement reached between the parties, as evidenced by the Mediation Settlement executed on 23rd July, 2024 between the Petitioners and Respondent No.2/ Complainant. A copy of the aforementioned Mediation Agreement executed before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, has been duly placed on record.



2. The marriage between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 was solemnised on 27th April, 2008, however the parties eventually separated on account of temperamental differences. No child was born from the marriage of the parties. The marriage has now been dissolved through decree of divorce by mutual consent dated 7th December, 2024 issued by the Family Court (Central), Tis Hazari Court, Delhi.

3. In terms of the Mediation Agreement, Petitioner No. 1 had agreed to pay a total sum of INR 8,50,000/- to Respondent No. 2. Of the said amount, a sum of INR 5,50,00/- had already been paid to Respondent No. 2, at the stage of recording of the joint statement of parties u/s 13B (2) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. The remaining amount of INR 3,00,000/- was agreed to be paid to Respondent No. 2 at the time of quashing of the impugned FIR. In this regard, the Petitioners have placed on record a copy of the demand draft bearing DD No. 023965, for the sum of INR 3,00,000/- drawn on HDFC Bank dated 12th December, 2024.

4. The Petitioners as well Respondent No. 2 are present in person, duly identified by the IO as well as their counsel. Respondent No. 2 states that she has no objections to the quashing of the FIR. An affidavit cum No Objection Certificate to this effect has also been placed on record.

5. Before the Joint Registrar, on 16th January, 2025, Petitioner No. 1 gave the demand draft to Respondent No. 2. Thereafter, the statement of Respondent No. 2 was recorded on the same day, wherein she affirmed receipt of the entire settlement amount, as well as her articles and *Stridhan*. On 11th February, 2025, Respondent No. 2 appeared before the Joint Registrar's Court through video conferencing, and submitted that the DD

¹ "IPC"



had been duly realised, and that she had no objection to the quashing of the impugned FIR.

6. At this juncture, it is imperative to emphasise the Court's power under Section 482 of the CrPC to quash criminal proceedings pursuant to a settlement between the parties. In this regard, the Supreme Court in *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*,² has laid down certain guidelines and parameters for the High Courts while accepting settlement and quashing the proceedings:

“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.

² (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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]

7. In view of the law discussed above as well as the settlement between the parties, the Court is of the considered opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus, as the continuation of the present proceedings would serve no fruitful purpose, but rather only amount to an abuse of the judicial process and impose an unwarranted burden on the State Exchequer.

8. Accordingly, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 132/2018 dated 26th March, 2018, registered at P.S. Burari under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

9. The parties shall abide by the terms of settlement.

10. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of. Pending applications (if any) are disposed of as infructuous.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MARCH 5, 2025

nk