

Manoj Kumar and ors Vs. the State and anr

Manoj Kumar and ors Vs. the State and anr

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1170005

Court : Delhi

Decided On : Oct-17-2014

Judge : Sudershan Kumar Misra

Appellant : Manoj Kumar and ors

Respondent : The State and anr

Judgement :

\$~26 * IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI + CRL.M.C. 4757/2014
MANOJ KUMAR & ORS Petitioners Through Mr. Yogesh Swaroop and Ms. Asha Garg, Advocates with Petitioner Nos.1, 2 and 3. versus THE STATE & ANR Respondents Through Mr. O. P. Saxena, Additional Public Prosecutor. Sub Inspector Ombir Singh. Mr. B.K. Dubey, Advocate with complainant in person.
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA %
SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA, J.(Oral) Crl.M.A. No.16290/2014 Exemption, as prayed for, is allowed, subject to all just exceptions. This application is disposed off. Crl.M.C. No.4757/2014 1. This petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of FIR No.178/2011 under Sections 498-A, 406, 34 IPC at police station Farsh Bajar on 06.07.2011, on the ground that the matter has been settled between the parties.

2. Issue notice. Mr. O. P. Saxena, Additional Public Prosecutor for the State and Mr. B.K. Dubey, Advocate for respondent No.2/ complainant, enter appearance and accept notice. The complainant, as well as the petitioners, are present in

person. They are also identified by the Investigating Officer, Sub Inspector Ombir Singh.

3. It is stated that the aforesaid FIR came to be lodged by the complainant as a result of domestic and matrimonial disputes that had arisen pursuant to her marriage to the first petitioner Manoj Kumar on 20.01.2008.

4. Thereafter, on a reference by the court of the learned Magistrate, which was considering the anticipatory bail moved by the first petitioner, the parties reached a settlement before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi on 02.08.2011. A copy of the Settlement recorded on 02.08.2011 has also been annexed to this petition. At that time, both the parties had been living separately since 24.12.2009. The first petitioner had also instituted proceedings under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955 before the Court of A.C.J.M., Buland Shahar, U.P. After the settlement, that was arrived at, the first petitioner is stated to have withdrawn the aforesaid petition under Section 9 of the Hindu Marriage Act. At the same time, since all the disputes were resolved, the complainant and the first petitioner started residing together, and a child has also been borne to them in 2012.

5. The complainant approbates the aforesaid settlement and states that she has no outstanding grievances against the petitioners, and that she does not wish to continue with the proceedings with a view to preserving domestic peace and harmony.

6. Counsel for the State also submits that looking to the overall circumstances, and where the parties have amiably settled the matter and have begun to reside together to continue their married life ; no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the matter, specially, where the complainant is no longer interested in supporting the prosecution.

7. Under the circumstances, and looking to the decisions of the Supreme Court in Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC303 which has referred to a number of matters for the proposition that even a noncompoundable offence can also be quashed on the ground of a settlement agreement between the offender and the

victim, if the circumstances so warrant; by observing as under:

58.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.

And also in *Narinder Singh and Ors. v. State of Punjab and Anr.* 2014(2) Crimes 67 (SC) where the Supreme Court held as follows:

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 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 pre-dominantly 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. 29.6 Offences under Section 307 Indian Penal Code would fall in the category of heinous and serious offences and therefore is to be generally treated as crime against the society and not against the individual alone. However, the High Court would not rest its decision merely because there is a mention of Section 307 Indian Penal Code in the FIR or the charge is framed under this provision. It would be open to the High Court to examine as to whether incorporation of Section 307 Indian Penal Code is there for the sake of it or the prosecution has collected sufficient evidence, which if proved, would lead to proving the charge under Section 307 Indian Penal Code. For this purpose, it would be open to the High Court to go by the nature of injury sustained, whether such injury is inflicted on the vital/delegate parts of the body, nature of weapons used etc. Medical report in respect of injuries suffered by the victim can generally be the guiding factor. On the basis of this prima facie analysis, the High Court can examine as to whether there is a strong possibility of conviction or the chances of conviction are remote and bleak. In the former case it can refuse to accept the settlement and quash the criminal proceedings whereas in the later case it would be permissible for the High Court to accept the plea compounding the offence based on complete settlement between the parties. At this stage, the Court can also be swayed by the fact that the settlement between the parties is going to result in harmony between them which may improve their future relationship. 29.7

While deciding whether to exercise its power under Section 482 of the Code or not, timings of settlement play a crucial role. Those cases where the settlement is arrived at immediately after the alleged commission of offence and the matter is still under investigation, the High Court may be liberal in accepting the settlement to quash the criminal proceedings/investigation. It is because of the reason that at this stage the investigation is still on and even the charge sheet has not been filed. Likewise, those cases where the charge is framed but the evidence is yet to start or the evidence is still at infancy stage, the High Court can show benevolence in exercising its powers favourably, but after prima facie assessment of the circumstances/material mentioned above. On the other hand, where the prosecution evidence is almost complete or after the conclusion of the evidence the matter is at the stage of argument, normally the High Court should refrain from exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code, as in such cases the trial court would be in a position to decide the case finally on merits and to come a conclusion as to whether the offence under Section 307 Indian Penal Code is committed or not. Similarly, in those cases where the conviction is already recorded by the trial court and the matter is at the appellate stage before the High Court, mere compromise between the parties would not be a ground to accept the same resulting in acquittal of the offender who has already been convicted by the trial court. Here charge is proved under Section 307 Indian Penal Code and conviction is already recorded of a heinous crime and, therefore, there is no question of sparing a convict found guilty of such a crime.

And specifically in respect of matrimonial disputes in *Jitendra Raghuvanshi & Ors. v. Babita Raghuvanshi & Anr.* (2013) 4 SCC58 where the Supreme Court held as follows:

15. In our view, it is the duty of the courts to encourage genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes, particularly, when the same are on considerable increase. Even if the offences are non-compoundable, if they relate to matrimonial disputes and the Court is satisfied that the parties have settled the same amicably and without any pressure, we hold that for the purpose of securing ends of justice, Section 320 of the Code would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing of FIR, complaint or the subsequent criminal proceedings.

16. There has been an outburst of matrimonial disputes in recent times. The institution of marriage occupies an important place and it has an important role to play in the society. Therefore, every effort should be made in the interest of the individuals in order to enable them to settle down in life and live peacefully. If the parties ponder over their defaults and terminate their disputes amicably by mutual agreement instead of fighting it out in a court of law, in order to do complete justice in the matrimonial matters, the courts should be less hesitant in exercising their extraordinary jurisdiction. It is trite to state that the power under Section 482 should be exercised sparingly and with circumspection only when the Court is convinced, on the basis of material on record, that allowing the proceedings to continue would be an abuse of process of court or that the ends of justice require that the proceedings ought to be quashed.

I am of the opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus since the parties have amicably resolved their disputes, and have decided to continue with their married life, and have been living together since the year 2011, and where the complainant is not interested in supporting the prosecution, thereby greatly diminishing the chances of its success.

8. Consequently, the petition is allowed, and FIR No.178/2011 under Sections 498-A, 406, 34 IPC at police station Farsh Bajar, and all proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

9. The petition is disposed off. Crl.M.A. No.16291/2014 Counsel for the petitioner does not press this application since the same has become infructuous in view of the orders passed in the main petition quashing the FIR, and all proceedings emanating therefrom. The application is dismissed as infructuous. SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA, J OCTOBER17 2014 dr

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com