

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

Criminal M.C. No.4345 of 2009

%

25.08.2010

BHAVRAJ FINANCIAL SERVICES

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Anita Tiwari, Advocate with
Mr. Kuldeep Mansukhani, petitioner
in person.

Versus

STATE & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Sharma, APP for the State.
Mr. Rupesh Goel, Advocate for the
complainant.

Reserved on: 8th July, 2010
Pronounced on: 25th August, 2010

JUSTICE SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA

1. Whether reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?
2. To be referred to the reporter or not?
3. Whether judgment should be reported in Digest?

J U D G M E N T

1. This petition has been filed for quashing of F.I.R. No.368 of 2004 under Sections 406/420 IPC registered at Police Station Connaught Place. The petitioner submits that at the time of grant of bail, he had deposited a sum of ₹ 1,45,000/- in the court. He wants to compromise the matter with the complainants. He states that this amount which he had deposited with the court be permitted to be released in favour of the complainants and the F.I.R. be quashed.

2. The offences under Sections 406/420 IPC are compoundable offences with permission of the court. In case the complainants intend to compromise with him, he should enter into a written compromise with the complainants and make an appropriate

application with the court of Metropolitan Magistrate where the matter is pending and pray for recording the compromise. It is directed that in case a compromise is arrived at between the petitioner and the complainants, the amount lying in the court be disbursed amongst the complainants in terms of the compromise.

3. I find no reason to quash the F.I.R. when there is a provision for compounding of the offence. The petition is hereby dismissed.

SHIV NARAYAN DHINGRA
[JUDGE]

AUGUST 25, 2010
‘AA’