

\$~14

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 3083/2015**
PRINCE VERMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. M.S. Bammi, Mr. Manish Gupta
& Mr. Vivek Bhati, Advs.

versus

THE STATE & ANR

..... Respondent

Through: Mr.R.S. Kundu, ASC for the State
with Mr. Ankit Gulia & Mr. Vishesh
Wadhwa, Advs.
S.I. Neeraj Kumar, P.S. Mandawali
Mr. Nitin Kumar, Adv. for R-2

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ASHUTOSH KUMAR
ORDER
% **23.12.2015**

Crl.M.A No.18899/2015

Exemption granted subject to all just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 3083/2015

The petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No.915/2015 (P.S. Mandawali)
instituted for offences under Sections 394/34 of the IPC.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from the bare reading
of the FIR it would appear that no case under Section 394 of the IPC can at
all be said to have made out.

It is submitted that on 27.09.2015 when the complainant asked the

brother in law of the petitioner to remove his vehicle from the road, some verbal scuffle took place. The father of the complainant was given a push by the brother in law of the petitioner. The matter was settled at that point of time. However, later, i.e. on 25.10.2015 when the complainant was going in his car to some place he was intercepted by the petitioner and his associates. The complainant was assaulted by the brick-bats and he was also divested of his gold chain. As a result of the aforesaid, the subject FIR (FIR No.915/2015) was lodged for investigation.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner and the complainant are neighbours and because of a trivial dispute, the present case was lodged. Later, while the petitioner moved his bail application, the complainant had appeared before the Court and submitted that the gold chain was found in his car only.

In any view of the matter, with the intervention of the neighbours and well wishers of both the families, a settlement was arrived at. It was agreed between the petitioner and respondent No.2 on 20.10.2015 that they shall stay as a good neighbour and would not cause any disturbance to each other in future.

Petitioner and the complainant (respondent No.2) are present in Court. The complainant, respondent No.2 submits that he has no objection to the FIR being quashed.

Considering the fact that petitioner and respondent No.2 are neighbours and the dispute arose out of a petty issue of removing the car from the road and the grievance of respondent No.2 has now been redressed, this Court is inclined to quash the present FIR.

Considering the aforesaid fact, the subject FIR No.915/2015 (P.S. Mandawali) and all the emanating proceedings thereof are hereby quashed.

ASHUTOSH KUMAR, J

DECEMBER 23, 2015

ns