

13.

*IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ CRL.M.C. 2795/2010

VIRENDER @ MUNISH

..... Petitioner

Through Mr. B.K. Singh, Advocate along with
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE & ORS.

..... Respondents

Through Mr. Arvind Kumar Gupta, APP for
the State.

Respondent No. 2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJIV KHANNA

ORDER

05.10.2010

%

Respondent No. 2 is present in person. Let his statement be recorded on oath.

I have heard the statement made by the respondent No. 2. I have also spoken to the petitioner, who is a student and studying for getting a degree/diploma in M.B.A. I have verified the facts. The petitioner and the respondent No. 2 are otherwise known to each other as the respondent No. 2 has a shop in the locality where the petitioner is residing with his parents. They have resolved their differences and the respondent No. 2 does not want to proceed further against the petitioner. In the FIR/charge sheet it is alleged that the respondent No. 2 was deprived of his mobile phone. The respondent No. 2 has stated that the mobile phone has been returned to him.

Keeping in view the nature of allegations and the fact that the parties have amicably resolved and sorted out their disputes and differences, the present petition is allowed to the extent that proceedings against the petitioner pursuant to FIR No. 437/2008, Police Station

Signature Not Verified

Signing Date: 03.08.2024 17:25:36
Certify that the digital and physical file have
been compared and the digital data is as per
the physical file and no page is missing.

3
Mehrauli under Section 356/379/411/34 IPC are hereby set aside/quashed.

The complainant has been identified by the counsel for the petitioner.

The petition is accordingly disposed of.

DASTI.

3-11C
SANJIV KHANNA, J.

OCTOBER 05, 2010

VKR