

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

+ **Crl.M.C.No.2293/2008**

% **Date of decision : 23.07.2008**

Rinku @ Sh. Jai Pal & Others Petitioners
Through: Mr.B.S. Chauhan, Advocate.

Versus

State (NCT of Delhi) & Another Respondents
Through : Mr.R.N. Vats, APP for the State
along with SI Sudama Sharma,
P.S. Rohini.
Mr.Diwakar Sinha, Advocate for
NDPL.

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.

*

+ **Crl.M.A. No.8537/2008 in Crl.M.C. No.2293/2008**

Allowed, subject to just exceptions.

The application is disposed of.

Crl.M.C. No.2293/2008 & Crl.M.A. No.8536/2008

Issue notice. Mr.Vats accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.1 and Mr.Sinha accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2. Learned

counsel for petitioner Nos.1 to 3 and respondent No.2 state that the matter has been settled between the parties and pursuant to the settlement the amount due to respondent No.2 has been paid by petitioner Nos.1 and 2. Learned counsel contends that since the matter has been settled, no useful purpose shall be served in continuing the proceedings pursuant to FIR NO.1100/2007 under Section 135/150 of the Electricity Act registered at Police Station Rohini.

It is also contended that continuing the proceeding shall be waste of public money and it shall be in the interest of justice if the said FIR is quashed against petitioners 1 to 3.

Considering the facts and totality of circumstances, since the matter has been settled between the respondent No.2 and petitioner Nos.1 to 3, no useful purpose shall be served in continuing the FIR NO.1100/2007 under Section 135/150 of the Electricity Act registered at Police Station Rohini. It is also in the interest of justice to quash the said FIR. Therefore, the FIR and all proceeding emanating therefrom against the petitioner Nos.1 to 3 are quashed against petitioner Nos.1 to 3.

With these directions, the petition and the pending application are disposed of. Dasti.

July 23, 2008
'Dev'

ANIL KUMAR, J.