

Rahul Deora and Another Vs. State and Another

Rahul Deora and Another Vs. State and Another

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1183673

Court : Delhi

Decided On : Mar-08-2016

Judge : P.S.Teji

Appeal No. : CRL.M.C.No. 1247 of 2015 & CrI.M.A. No. 4581 of 2015

Appellant : Rahul Deora and Another

Respondent : State and Another

Judgement :

1. The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. has been filed by the petitioners, namely, Rahul Deora and Archana Deora for quashing of FIR No.121/2012 dated 26.04.2012, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station Kalkaji on the basis of the compromise deed arrived at between Vikas Deora (husband of respondent no.2) and respondent No.2, namely, Smt. Ritu Agarwal on 19.11.2013.

2. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submitted that the respondent No.2, present in the Court has been identified to be the complainant/first-informant of the FIR in question by her counsel.

3. The factual matrix of the present case is that the marriage between Vikas Deora and the respondent no.2 was solemnized on 24.02.2008 as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. From the very inception of the marriage, the husband of the complainant and other in-laws were not happy with the dowry articles and gave cruel treatment to the complainant. The mother-in-law i.e. petitioner no.2 of the

complainant hatched a criminal conspiracy with others and retained all the gold ornaments and istridhan of the complainant. The petitioner no.1 started manhandling the complainant before her husband. On 10.05.2008, petitioners and the husband of the complainant along with the complainant came to the parental home of the complainant and repeated their unlawful demands of more cash and one big luxury car and left the complainant there.

The respondent no.2/complainant filed a complaint before the CAW Cell, Nanakpura against the petitioners which resulted into the registration of the FIR in question. The police filed the challan under Section 173 Cr.P.C. and the proceedings started. The complainant/ respondent no.2 and her husband opted to take divorce by mutual consent and amicably settled all their disputes.

4. Respondent No.2, present in the Court, submitted that the dispute between the parties has been amicable resolved. As per the compromise deed, respondent no.2 has settled all her claims of every nature in respect to the marriage and the dowry articles, istridhan, past, present and future maintenance and compensation in sum of Rs.11,50,000/- from Vikas Deora. It is also agreed that both parties shall move a first motion petition before the competent Court for dissolution of their marriage preferably by 19.11.2013. Vikas Deora shall hand over the demand draft of Rs. 2 Lacs in the name of respondent no.2 at the time of recording of statement in the petition. It is also agreed that Vikas Deora shall also make a lien marking/bank guarantee for Rs. 2.5 Lacs in the name of respondent no.2 which shall be handed over to respondent no.2 at the time of quashing of the FIR in question. It is also agreed that respondent no.2 shall withdraw her complaint under Section 12 of D.V. Act filed against Vikas Deora and his family members and at the time of withdrawal of the said complaint, Vikas Deora shall pay Rs.3,00,000/- through demand draft in the name of respondent no.2. It is agreed that if Vikas Deora does not cooperate with respondent no.2 in recording of statement for second motion petition, respondent no.2 shall be entitled to encash the said Lien marking/ Bank Guarantee and the amount given by Vikas Deora till that date would be forfeited. It is also agreed that if respondent no.2 does not come forward for the recording of statement for second motion, then Vikas Deora shall be at liberty to cancel the Lien marking/Bank Guarantee and that respondent no.2 shall

have to return, to him, all amount received till that date. It is also agreed that Vikas Deora shall file a petition before this Court for the quashing of the FIR in question. It is also agreed that Vikas Deora shall give a demand draft of Rs. 4 Lacs to the respondent no.2 and that after the receipt of the same, respondent no.2 shall have to cooperate for the quashing of the FIR in question. It is also agreed that in case of any default from Vikas Deora in fulfilling the aforesaid terms and condition to this deed, respondent no.2 shall have the liberty to restore the complaint under Section 12 of the D.V. Act against him and his family members and other proceedings as per the provisions of law and the amount received by the respondent no.2 shall be forfeited and that Vikas Deora shall not claim the said amount from respondent no.2 in future. It is also agreed that in case of default from the respondent no.2 in fulfilling the terms of the compromise deed, Vikas Deora shall be at liberty to recover the said amount from respondent no.2. and that divorce may be granted to him. It is also agreed that after receiving the said amount the parties shall not file any case or complaint against each other or their families with respect to past disputes between both parties and that they shall withdraw all cases civil/criminal against each other and their respective family members. It is also agreed that the date of marriage is agreed to be 24.02.2008 and that there shall be no dispute with regard to this date whatsoever in the future by either party. It is further agreed that the parties shall not use each other's names in any government and private/public record in future. Respondent No.2 affirmed the contents of the aforesaid settlement. All the disputes and differences have been resolved through mutual consent. Now no dispute with petitioners survives and so, the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be brought to an end. Statement of the respondent No.2 has been recorded in this regard in which she stated that she has entered into a compromise with the petitioners and has settled all the disputes with them. She further stated that she has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

5. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab* (2012) 10 SCC 303 Apex Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes in cases like the instant one, by observing as under:-

61. 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 proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings 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 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 proceedings.

6. The aforesaid dictum stands reiterated by the Apex Court in a recent judgment in *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab* (2014) 6 SCC 466. The relevant observations of the Apex Court in *Narinder Singh* (Supra) are 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.

7. The inherent powers of the High Court ought to be exercised to prevent the abuse of process of law and to secure the ends of justice. The respondent no.2 agrees to the quashing of the FIR in question without any threat or coercion or undue influence and has stated that the matter has been settled out of her own free will. As the matter has been settled and compromised amicably, so, there would be an extraordinary delay in the process of law if the legal proceedings between the parties are carried on. So, this Court is of the considered opinion that this is a fit case to invoke the jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to prevent the abuse of process of law and to secure the ends of justice.

8. The incorporation of inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. is meant to deal with the situation in the absence of express provision of law to secure the ends of justice such as, where the process is abused or misused; where the ends of justice cannot be secured; where the process of law is used for unjust or unlawful object; to avoid the causing of harassment to any person by using the provision of Cr.P.C. or to avoid the delay of the legal process in the delivery of justice. Whereas, the inherent power is not to be exercised to circumvent the express provisions of law.

9. It is settled law that the inherent power of the High Court under Section 482 Cr.P.C. should be used sparingly. The Hon ble Apex Court in the case of State of Maharashtra through CBI v. Vikram Anatrai Doshi and Ors. MANU/SC/0842/2014

and in the case of Inder Singh Goswami v. State of Uttaranchal MANU/SC/0808/2009 has observed that powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. must be exercised sparingly, carefully and with great caution. Only when the Court comes to the conclusion that there would be manifest injustice or there would be abuse of the process of the Court if such power is not exercised, Court would quash the proceedings.

10. It is a well settled law that where the High Court is convinced that the offences are entirely personal in nature and therefore do not affect public peace or tranquillity and where it feels that quashing of such proceedings on account of compromise would bring about peace and would secure ends of justice, it should not hesitate to quash them. In such cases, pursuing prosecution would be waste of time and energy. Non-compoundable offences are basically an obstruction in entering into compromise. In certain cases, the main offence is compoundable but the connected offences are not. In the case of B.S. Joshi and others v. State of Haryana and another 2003 (4) SCC 675 the Hon ble Apex Court observed that even though the provisions of Section 320 Cr.P.C. would not apply to such offences which are not compoundable, it did not limit or affect the powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. The Hon ble Apex Court laid down that if for the purpose of securing the ends of justice, quashing of FIR becomes necessary, section 320 Cr.P.C. would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing. In the nutshell, the Hon ble Apex Court justified the exercise of powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to quash the proceedings to secure the ends of justice in view of the special facts and circumstances of the case, even where the offences were noncompoundable. In the light of the aforesaid, this Court is of the view that notwithstanding the fact the offence under Section 498A IPC is a noncompoundable offence, there should be no impediment in quashing the FIR under this section, if the Court is otherwise satisfied that the facts and circumstances of the case so warrant.

11. The Courts in India are now normally taking the view that endeavour should be taken to promote conciliation and secure speedy settlement of disputes relating to marriage and family affairs such as, matrimonial disputes between the couple or/and between the wife and her in-laws. India being a vast country naturally has large number of married persons resulting into high numbers of matrimonial

disputes due to differences in temperament, life-styles, opinions, thoughts etc. between such couples, due to which majority is coming to the Court to get redressal. In its 59th report, the Law Commission of India had emphasized that while dealing with disputes concerning the family, the Court ought to adopt an approach radically different from that adopted in ordinary civil proceedings and that it should make reasonable efforts at settlement before the commencement of the trial. Further it is also the constitutional mandate for speedy disposal of such disputes and to grant quick justice to the litigants. But, our Courts are already overburdened due to pendency of large number of cases because of which it becomes difficult for speedy disposal of matrimonial disputes alone. As the matrimonial disputes are mainly between the husband and the wife and personal matters are involved in such disputes, so, it requires conciliatory procedure to bring a settlement between them. Nowadays, mediation has played a very important role in settling the disputes, especially, matrimonial disputes and has yielded good results. The Court must exercise its inherent power under Section 482 Cr.P.C. to put an end to the matrimonial litigations at the earliest so that the parties can live peacefully.

12. Since the subject matter of this FIR is essentially matrimonial, which now stands mutually and amicably settled between the parties, therefore, continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility and is a fit case for this Court to exercise its inherent jurisdiction.

13. In the facts and circumstances of this case, in view of statement made by the respondent No.2 and the compromise arrived at between the parties, the FIR in question warrants to be put to an end and proceedings emanating thereupon need to be quashed.

14. Accordingly, this petition is allowed and FIR No.121/2012 dated 26.04.2012, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station Kalkaji and the proceedings emanating there from are quashed against the petitioners.

15. This petition is accordingly disposed of.

16. Application Crl.M.A. No.4581/2015 is also disposed of accordingly.

