

\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 2378/2011

% *Judgment delivered on: 31st October, 2011*

JOGINDER SINGH & ORS. Petitioner

Through : Mr. Rajpal Singh, Adv.

versus

STATE & ORS. Respondent

Through : Ms. Rajdipa Behura, APP
along with W/ASI Sumedha.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESH KAIT

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Whether the Reporters of local papers
may be allowed to see the judgment? | No. |
| 2. To be referred to Reporter or not? | No. |
| 3. Whether the judgment should be reported
in the Digest? | No. |

SURESH KAIT, J. (Oral)

1 This is a petition for quashing of the FIR bearing No.156/2009 registered under Section 498A/406/34 Indian Penal Code, 1860 at Police Station CAW Cell, Nankpura, New Delhi.

2 Learned counsel for petitioners submit that respondent No.2 Ms.Inderpreet Kaur @ Goldy who is the complainant in present case and respondent No.3 Sh.Gurpreet Singh

(husband of respondent No.2) are living together at Shalimar Garden, Sahibabad, Ghaziabad, UP. Therefore, they are happily living their married life and have settled their disputes qua the aforesaid FIR.

3 Further submits that vide settlement dated 04.10.2010 arrived at between the parties at Mediation Centre, District Courts, Rohini, the matter has been settled.

4 Respondent No. 2/complainant is personally present in the court today. She has been duly identified by W/ASI Sumedha, P.S. Nanka Pura, Delhi. She submits that she has resolved all the issues qua the aforesaid FIR with the petitioners. She states that she is living happily with her husband/respondent No. 1 and has no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

5 Keeping in view the settlement dated 04.10.2010 and the statement of respondent No.2/complainant, in the interest of justice, the FIR No. 156/2009, under Sections 498 A/406/34 Indian Penal Code, 1860, PS CAW Cell, Nanakpura, New Delhi and all the proceedings emanating therefrom is quashed.

6 Criminal M.C. 2378/2011 is allowed in the above terms.

7 No order as to costs, keeping the financial position of the petitioners in view.

SURESH KAIT,J

OCTOBER 31, 2011

j