

10
\$~R-30 & 31

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

(i) + **CRL.M.C. 3058/2012**

DAMANJEET KAUR Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sushant Kumar, Advocate

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Karan Singh, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State

(ii) + **CRL.M.C. 3372/2012**

ANANT SINGH DHILLON Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sushant Kumar, Advocate

versus

GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Karan Singh, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State -

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

% **13.07.2015**

In the above-captioned two petitions, quashing of complaint No.36/1/2012 titled *Ashwani Arya v. Mission Pmt. Institute Pvt. Ltd & Ors.* on the basis of which FIR No.166/2012 under Sections 406/420/467/468/471/506/34/120-B of IPC registered at P.S. Janakpuri, Delhi, is sought on merits.

CRL.M.C. 3058 & 3372 of 2012

Page 1

11

Since both these petitions arise out of one FIR, therefore, with the consent of learned counsel for the parties, both these petitions are being taken up together and by this common order, they are being disposed of.

At the hearing, learned counsel for petitioners informs that the closure report has been filed in the aforesaid FIR case in which the aforesaid complaint has been merged.

In view of the aforesaid, the above captioned two petitions are disposed of as infructuous.

At this stage, learned counsel for petitioners submits that in the event of a protest petition being filed, liberty be granted to petitioners to avail of the remedies as available in law. Needless to say, as and when the protest petition is filed by the complainant/first-informant of the FIR in question, then petitioners can always avail of the remedies as available in law to them.


(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

JULY 13, 2015

S