

Vivek Kumar and ors Vs. the State of Delhi and ors

Vivek Kumar and ors Vs. the State of Delhi and ors

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1171165

Court : Delhi

Decided On : Sep-02-2014

Judge : Sudershan Kumar Misra

Appellant : Vivek Kumar and ors

Respondent : The State of Delhi and ors

Judgement :

§~26 * IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI + CRL.M.C. 3960/2014
VIVEK KUMAR & ORS Petitioners Through Mr Yogesh Kumar and Mr P K
Sharma, Adv. versus THE STATE OF DELHI & ORS Respondents Through
Mr O P Saxena, APP for the State with ASI Yuddhavir Singh Ms Sangita Jain,
Adv. for R-2 CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA %
SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA, J.

(Oral) Crl.M.A.13572/2014(exemption) Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. The applications stand disposed off. CRL.M.C. 3960/2014 1. This petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 has been moved by petitioners seeking quashing of FIR No.28/2013 under section 498A/406/34 dated 2.9.2013 registered at Police Station Karawal Nagar, on the ground that the matter has been amicably settled between petitioners and the complainant-Preeti, who is the second respondent.

2. Counsel for the State as well counsel for complainant enters appearance and accepts notice.
3. The complainant Ms. Preeti is present in person. She is identified by the petitioner as well as complainants advocate. It is stated that FIR was lodged by the respondent on account of matrimonial disputes between the first petitioner and the complainant after their marriage on 12th March, 2012. The matter is still at the stage of investigation. Further that a petition under section 13B(2) of the Hindu Marriage Act was filed jointly seeking divorce by mutual consent by the petitioner and the complainant, and their marriage has been dissolved by the matrimonial court on 31st January, 2014 in HMA8132013. Before that on 18th January, 2014, the parties had also recorded their statement on oath before the matrimonial court setting down all the terms and conditions upon which they had settled their disputes. In terms thereof the complainant-respondent No.2 was to receive a total amount of Rs.4 lakhs from the first petitioner. Out of this Rs.2,50,000/- stands paid; and the remaining Rs.1.5 lakhs has been handed over to her in Court today by way of two demand drafts of Rs.75,000/- each, bearing No.716764 and 716765, dated 5.5.2014 favouring the complainant Preeti Sharma, drawn on Punjab National Bank.
4. The complainant also approbates the aforesaid settlement recorded by the Family Court and states that after the receipt of the aforesaid amount of Rs.1.5 lakhs nothing more is due to her from the first petitioner. She also states that she does not wish to continue with the matter, and that the same be closed.
5. Counsel for the State submits that since the matter is arising out of matrimonial dispute, where the parties have settled, and the complainant is not interested in supporting the prosecution, no useful purpose will be served in continuing the proceedings.
6. Under the circumstances and looking to the decision of the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC303 which has referred to a number of matters for the proposition that even a non-compoundable 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.

7. 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.

8. I am of the opinion that the matter deserves to be given a quietus, since the complainant has settled her disputes with the petitioner; and has also divorced the petitioner by mutual consent, and is now not interested in supporting the prosecution, thus reducing its chances of success. Consequently, FIR No.28/2013 under section 498A/406/34 dated 2.9.2013 registered at Police Station Karawal Nagar and all the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed. The petition stands disposed off. SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA Judge SEPTEMBER02 2014
vld