

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

Date of Decision: January 27, 2015

+ CRL.M.C. 3633/2014

MANJIT SINGH & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Jatin Rajput & Mr. Anupam
Dubey, Advocates

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Ms. Nishi Jain, Additional Public
Prosecutor for respondent-State
with SI Ram Babu
Respondent No.2/ first-informant
in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

JUDGMENT
(ORAL)

%

Quashing of FIR No. 133/2009, under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the IPC, registered at police station Khyala , Delhi is sought on the basis of mediated settlement of 23rd November, 2012 (*Annexure-D*) arrived at Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

Notice.

Ms. Nishi Jain, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State accepts notice and submits that respondent No.2, present in the Court, is complainant/first-informant of the FIR in question and she has been identified to be so by her counsel as well as by SI Ram Babu,

Investigating Officer of this case.

Learned Additional Public Prosecutor for State submits on instructions that the trial of this FIR case has not yet begun.

Respondent No.2, present in the Court, submits that the dispute between the parties has been amicably resolved vide aforesaid settlement and terms thereof have been fully acted upon and that divorce by mutual consent has been already granted by the concerned family court on 7th November, 2013. Respondent No.2 affirms the contents of aforesaid settlement and of her affidavit of 1st May, 2014 supporting this petition and submits that now no dispute with petitioners survives and so, the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be brought to an end.

In '*Gian Singh Vs State of Punjab*' (2012) 10 SCC 303, Apex Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes in cases like the instant one, by observing as under:-

“Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups, therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.

Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put

to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor.”

Since the subject matter of this FIR is essentially matrimonial, which now stands mutually and amicably settled between parties, therefore, continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility.

Accordingly, this petition is allowed and FIR No. 133/2009, under Sections 498-A/406/34 of the IPC, registered at police station Khyala , Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed qua petitioners.

This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

JANUARY 27, 2015

r