

08.01.2025
Serial no. 22
Ct. No. 30
Piya

CRR 1472 of 2024
+
IA No.: CRAN 7 of 2025

Arijit Das
Vs.
The State of West Bengal & Anr.

Mr. Sabyasachi Banerjee, Sr. Adv.
Ms. Koel Mukherjee
Mr. Anurag Sardar
Mr. M. Murshed
..... for the Petitioner

Mr. Arijit Ganguly
Ms. Poulami Bose
..... for the State

Mr. Jayanta Narayan Chatterjee
Ms. Moumita Pandit
Ms. Ritushree Banerjee
..... For the Opposite Party No. 2

1. The present revision has been preferred praying for setting aside of order dated 27th February, 2024 whereby the Learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Bench-I, Bichar Bhawan, at Calcutta was inter alia pleased to reject the application for discharge and frame charges under Section 376/417 of the Indian Penal Code against the petitioner herein in connection with of Park Street Police Station Case No. 250 of 2019 dated 25.12.2019 under Section 376/417/506/120B of the Indian Penal Code and the corresponding proceeding Sessions Case No. 26 of 2021.

2. **CRAN 7 of 2025** filed, is a joint application on affidavit stating that the parties have arrived at an amicable settlement in the present case and the complainant/opposite party does not have any grievance if the proceedings in the present case is quashed in respect of the petitioner.
3. A Three Judge Bench of the Court in **(2012) 10 Supreme Court Cases, 303, Gian Singh vs State of Punjab** and another has cleared the position in respect of the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceedings in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction in para 61 of the judgment, which is reproduced here in:-

“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.”

4. In Anita Maria Dias & Anr. vs The State of Maharashtra & Anr. (2018) 3 SCC 290.

The Court held:-

- (a) Offences which are predominant of civil character, commercial transaction should be quashed when parties have resolved their dispute.
- (b) Timing of settlement would be crucial for exercise of power or declining to exercise power (stage of proceedings).

5. In ***Madhukar & Ors. vs The State of Maharashtra, [2025] 7 S.C.R. 568, decided on 14 July, 2025***, the Supreme Court held:-

“6. At the outset, we recognise that the offence under Section 376 IPC is undoubtedly of a grave and heinous nature. Ordinarily, quashing of proceedings involving such offences on the ground of settlement between the parties is discouraged and should not be permitted lightly. However, the power of the Court under Section 482 CrPC to secure the ends of justice is not constrained by a rigid formula and must be exercised with reference to the facts of each case.

8. Therefore, having considered the peculiar facts and circumstances of this case, and taking into account the categorical stand taken by the complainant and the nature of the settlement, we are of the opinion that the continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would only amount to abuse of process.”

6. **The joint application filed by the parties** clearly shows that an amicable settlement and compromise has been arrived at between the parties and **the complainant does not wish to proceed with the criminal case against the petitioner** being order dated 27th February, 2024 whereby the Learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Bench-I, Bichar Bhawan, at Calcutta was inter alia pleased to reject the application for discharge and frame charges under Section 376/417 of the Indian Penal Code against the petitioner herein in connection with of Park Street Police Station Case No. 250 of 2019 dated 25.12.2019 under Section 376/417/506/120B of the

Indian Penal Code and the corresponding proceeding Sessions Case No. 26 of 2021.

7. **From the materials on record,** it appears, that the dispute in the present case arises out of a relationship between the parties. The parties have now resolved their entire dispute by way of a compromise/settlement on affidavit and as such 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 could be caused to them by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the complainant, as in the words of the Supreme Court in ***(Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and another, (Supra))***.
8. As such, this court is of the view that it would be unfair and contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings which would tantamount to abuse of process of law in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties in respect of their dispute and to secure the ends of justice it would be prudent to quash the proceedings in the case as prayed for.
9. **The revisional application being CRR 1472 of 2024 is accordingly allowed, on compromise.**
10. The proceedings being Park Street Police Station Case No. 250 of 2019 dated 25.12.2019 under Section 376/417/506/120B of the Indian Penal Code and the corresponding proceeding Sessions Case No. 26 of 2021,

pending before the learned Additional District and Sessions Judge, Bench-I, Bichar Bhawan, at Calcutta, **is hereby quashed in respect of the petitioner herein namely Arijit Das.**

- 11.** All connected Applications, if any, stands disposed of.
- 12.** Interim order, if any, stands vacated.
- 13.** Copy of this order be sent to the learned Trial Court for necessary compliance.
- 14.** Urgent certified website copy of this order, if applied for, be supplied expeditiously after complying with all, necessary legal formalities.

(Shampa Dutt (Paul), J.)