

\$~25

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

Judgment delivered on: 16th November, 2015

+ **CRL.M.C. No.4621/2015**

JASMINE KAUR CHAWLA

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr.Suman Kapoor,
Mr.Osama Suhail, Mr.Hasan
Anzar and Mr.Samama
Suhail, Advs.

versus

STATE (GOVERNMENT OF NCT
OF DELHI) & ANR

..... Respondents

Represented by: Ms.Meenakshi Chauhan,
APP for the State with SI
Naveen Kumar, PS Hauz
Khas, Delhi in person.
Mr.Vinod Kumar, Adv for
R2 with R2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURESH KAIT

SURESH KAIT, J. (Oral)

1. Vide the present petition filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No.358/2009 registered at Police Station Hauz Khas and the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against her.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the aforesaid case was registered on the complaint of respondent No.2, Ms.Arunjeet Kaur and matter is pending for trial after filing of

supplementary charge sheet. Even the order on charge is under challenge before learned Revisional Court. The core issue between the parties revolves due to the marriage of petitioner with brother of respondent No.2. Meanwhile, the parties have amicably settled their disputes vide Compromise Deed dated 14.09.2015 before the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre for a total sum of Rs.2.15 Crores which will be paid after the second motion petition between the parties before learned Family Court. It is also informed that first motion petition has been allowed on 13.10.2015.

3. Respondent No.2 is personally present in the Court through learned counsel, above named and has also been duly identified by the Investigating Officer of the case. Learned counsel for respondent No.2 under instructions does not dispute as to what is stated by learned counsel for petitioner and consequent to settlement, respondent No.2 does not wish to pursue this case further and has no objection if the present petition is allowed.

4. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on behalf of the State submits that matter is pending trial after framing of charge. Since the parties have amicably settled the matter and the respondent No.2/ complainant does not wish to pursue the case against the petitioner, therefore, looking to the overall circumstances, no useful purpose will be served in continuing the proceedings. Thus, the State has no objection if the present petition is allowed.

5. Both the parties who are present in the Court today, approbate the aforesaid settlement dated 14.09.2015 and undertake to remain bound by

the same.

6. In view of the above discussion, considering the settlement arrived at between the parties and the statement of respondent No.2 and the learned counsel for the State, I am of the considered opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus as continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility.

7. Consequently, FIR No.358/2009 registered at Police Station Hauz Khas and all proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed against petitioner.

8. In view of the above, the present petition is allowed.

**SURESH KAIT
(JUDGE)**

NOVEMBER 16, 2015

M