

Ram Kumar and Ors Vs. State (Nct of Delhi) and Anr

Ram Kumar and Ors Vs. State (Nct of Delhi) and Anr

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/5861

Court : Delhi

Decided On : Dec-04-2014

Judge : Sudershan Kumar Misra

Appellant : Ram Kumar and Ors

Respondent : State (Nct of Delhi) and Anr

Advocate for Def. : Mr. Amit Ahlawat

Advocate for Pet/Ap. : Ms. Shobha Gupta

Judgement :

\$~5 * IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI + CRL.M.C. 4453/2014
RAM KUMAR & ORS Through: Petitioners Ms. Shobha Gupta, Advocate with
petitioners in person. versus STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondents
Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State with ASI Devender Kumar, PS
Uttam Nagar. Complainant in person along with his father Sh. S.S. Oberoi.
CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA SUDERSHAN
KUMAR MISRA, J.(Oral) 1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C.
seeking quashing of FIR No.146/2013 registered under Sections 307/34 IPC at
Police Station Uttam Nagar on 22nd March, 2013 on the ground that the matter
has been amicably settled between the parties.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Amit Ahlawat, Additional Public Prosecutor enters appearance
and accepts notice on behalf of the State/respondent No.1.

3. Petitioners and complainant are present in person. They are also identified by the Investigating Officer/ ASI Devender Kumar Police Station Uttam Nagar.
4. It is stated that the aforesaid FIR came to the lodged at the instance of the complainant/respondent No.2-Gaurav Oberoi alleging assault by the petitioners after an altercation that took place between him and the petitioners on 22nd March, 2013 over purchase of biscuits, etc.
5. It is stated that petitioners run a shop in the neighbourhood where the complainant resides. In the instant case, the complainant is stated to have received injury on his stomach. Ultimately, on 10th September, 2014 the parties instituted a Memorandum of Understanding setting out all the terms and conditions thereby stating that they have amicably resolved their disputes. In addition, counsel for the petitioners states, on instructions from the petitioners, that petitioners are willing to compensate the complainant and are also ready to pay any further costs that they may be imposed in this regard. He further states that the petitioners are willing to pay Rs.25,000/to the complainant towards compensation and another Rs.25,000/- towards costs.
6. The complainant also approbates this fact and he states that the above compensation as offered is acceptable to him. The said amount of Rs.25,000/- has been paid to him in the Court today. Complainant states that he does not wish to pursue the matter any further and prays that the same be closed.
7. Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the State submits that looking to the overall circumstances where the parties have amicably settled the matter on terms; and the complainant is no longer interested in supporting the prosecution, no useful purpose will be served in continuing the proceedings and the FIR be quashed, however, subject to payment appropriate costs.
8. Looking to the decision 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 non-compoundable offence can also be quashed on the basis of a settlement between the offender and the victim, if the circumstances so warrant; and also 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 the judgment of this Court in *Basara and Ors. v. State and Anr.* in Crl. M.C. No.6621-24/2006 decided on 3rd September, 2007, wherein it was, inter alia, held as under:

14.Peace has been brought in the locality with the intervention of the well wishers of the locality. When there is peace in locality, there will be peace in the town. When there is peace in town, there will be peace in city. When there is peace in city, there will be peace in State. When there is peace in State, there will be peace in country.....

15. The petition is according allowed. FIR No.4/2005 registered against the petitioners under Section 307 read with Section 34 IPC with Police station Samay Pur Badli is quashed and all consequent proceedings pursuant thereto are also ordered to be dropped.

I am of the opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus at this stage itself, since the parties have resolved their differences and have settled the matter on terms. CRL.M.C. 4453/2014 compensated, and is no longer interested in supporting the investigation thereby reducing the chances of its success, subject, however, to further payment of Rs.25,000/- as costs with the Indigent and Disabled Lawyers Fund of the Bar Council of Delhi. Counsel for the petitioners undertakes to deposit the same within one week from today. Proof of payment of costs be filed with the Registry of this Court within one week thereafter, with a copy to the Investigating Officer concerned.

9. Consequently, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No.146/2013 registered under Sections 307/34 IPC at Police Station Uttam Nagar on 22nd March, 2013, and all proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

10. The petition stands disposed off. SUDERSHAN KUMAR MISRA JUDGE
DECEMBER04 2014 AK

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