

\$~20/21

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 390/2012

SAVITA SINGHAL

..... Petitioner

Through :Mr. Daviender Hora, Adv. with
petitioner in person.

Versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

... Respondents

Through :Mr. Saleem Ahmed, ASC with Ms.
Charu Dalal, Adv. and IO/SI Arun
Dagar, P.S. K.N. Katju Marg for
respondent no. 1
Mr. Sikander Khan, Adv. for
respondent no. 2 with respondent no.
2 in person.

AND

+ W.P.(CRL) 391/2012

PUSHPINDER SINGH & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through : Mr. Sikander Khan, Adv.

Versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through : Mr. Saleem Ahmed, ASC with Ms.
Charu Dalal, Adv. and IO/SI Arun
Dagar, P.S. K.N. Katju Marg for
respondent no. 1
Mr. Daviender Hora, Adv. for
respondent no. 2 with respondent no.
2 in person.

5

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER
17.10.2012

%

Disputes involved in both the FIRs, which are subject matter of these petitions, had been registered on the directions of the Metropolitan Magistrate, Delhi under Section 156 (3) of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, are in respect of a Janta Flat bearing no. 243, Ground Floor, Block – F, Pocket – 5, Rohini. Complainants in the above FIRs, that is, Savita Singhal and Pushpinder Singh claimed themselves to be the owners of the aforesaid flat, based on the chain of documents in their power and possession. FIR No. 330/2011 under Sections 380/420/466/451/471/120-B was registered at Police Station K.N. Katju Marg on the complaint of Savita Singhal; whereas FIR No. 332/2011 under Sections 420/468/471/120-B IPC has been registered in the same Police Station on the complaint of Pushpinder Singh. In the FIR, Savita Singhal alleged that the documents on which Pushpinder Singh was placing reliance were forged and fabricated documents. She further alleged that Pushpinder Singh along with other petitioners in W.P. (Crl.) No. 391/2012 had forcibly occupied the flat.


Now, Savita Singhal, Pushpinder Singh and other petitioners in W.P.

/

(Crl.) No. 391/2012 have settled their disputes amicably on the terms and conditions as stipulated in the Compromise Deed/MOU dated 5th January, 2012. Pushpinder Singh has given up his claim over the said flat, inasmuch as, petitioner no. 4 has already executed a registered Sale Deed in favour of Savita Singhal. Pushpinder Singh and Savita Singhal, who are present in Court and have been identified by the Investigating Officer, submit that they have no objection in case both the FIRs are quashed.

Keeping in mind the settlement arrived at between the parties, no fruitful purpose would be served in keeping the criminal proceeding pending. Thus, in the interest of justice, FIR No. 330/2011 under Sections 380/420/466/451/471/120-B and FIR No. 332/2011 under Sections 420/468/471/120-B IPC both registered at Police Station K.N. Katju Marg and the consequent proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

Petitions are disposed of in the above terms. Dasti


A.K. PATHAK, J.

OCTOBER 17, 2012

rb