

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **CRL.M.C.No.1174/2007**

% **Date of Decision: 26.08.2008**

Pradeep Rana Petitioner

Through Mr.S.Arif, Advocate.

Versus

State (NCT of Delhi) and Another Respondents

Through Mr.R.N. Vats, APP for the State.
Mr.Punit K.Bhalla, Advocate for the
respondent No.2.
ASI Kanhaiya Lal, P.S.Rajouri Garden.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR

- | | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 1. | Whether reporters of Local papers may be allowed to see the judgment? | YES |
| 2. | To be referred to the reporter or not? | NO |
| 3. | Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest? | NO |

ANIL KUMAR, J.

*

This is a petition for quashing of FIR No.14/2006 under Section 420/406 of Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden. The petitioner has contended that he had purchased a car make Hyundai Santro bearing registration No.DL 4CP 0483 from the loan amount disbursed by the respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 had an express lien on the said vehicle. Since the amount of loan was not paid and the vehicle was not traceable, the complaint was filed by the

respondent No.2 leading to registration of FIR No.14/2006 under Section 420/406 of Indian Penal Code Police Station Rajouri Garden.

The learned counsel for the petitioner contends that the matter has since been settled with the respondent No.2 and in settlement an amount of Rs.2 lakhs has been paid to the respondent No.2 bank in full and final settlement of all the claims of respondent No.2 against the petitioner. The learned counsel for the respondent No.2 admits that there has been a settlement between the respondent No.2 and the petitioner and in pursuance to the settlement between the parties an amount of Rs.2 lakhs has been paid to the respondent No.2 bank in satisfaction of all the claims of respondent No.2 against the petitioner with respect to the agreement for purchase of car make Hyundai Santro bearing registration No.DL 4CP 0483.

In the circumstances, the learned counsel for the parties contend that no useful purpose would be served in continuing the proceedings pursuant to FIR No.14/2006 under Section 420/406 of Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden.

The counsel for the parties, therefore, also contend that the said FIR be quashed in the facts and circumstances.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor, Mr.Vats, in the facts and circumstances, has also no objection to quashing of FIR No.14/2006 under Section 420/406 of Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station

Rajouri Garden against the petitioner and all the proceedings emanating therefrom.

In the totality of facts and circumstances and in the interest of justice, the FIR No.14/2006 under Section 420/406 of Indian Penal Code registered at Police Station Rajouri Garden and all the proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioner are quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

Dasti.

August 26, 2008
'k'

ANIL KUMAR, J.