

\$~7

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 1632/2007

DEEPAK KUMAR & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Represented by: None.

versus

STATE N.C.T. OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Represented by: Ms.Nandita Rao,
Addl.Standing Counsel with
Mr.Varun Goswami, APP for
the State

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRADEEP NANDRAJOG

ORDER

% **30.05.2016**

1. The petitioners are the husband and the in-laws of the complainant.
2. Respondent No.2 seeks quashing of FIR No.931 P.S.Nangloi for offences punishable under Section 498A/406/34 IPC.
3. Status report filed evinces that the petitioners were granted anticipatory bail. In that, a direction was issued that a week's prior notice would be served before any petitioner was arrested.
4. I have read the FIR. There are allegations of dowry demands and harassment.
5. Be that as it may, in the decision reported as 2005 (1) SCC 568 State of Orissa Vs. Debendra Nath Padhi the law declared is that scope for judicial interference at the stage of registration of FIR is minimal. Though the decision dealt with the jurisdiction under Section 91 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, in paragraph 29 the Supreme observed that in a case where material produced by the accused is of unimpeachable character

evinced the sterling quality thereof, to do justice and to prevent abuse of the process of law or otherwise to secure ends of justice within the parameters laid down by the Supreme Court in the decision reported as 1992 Supply (1) SCC 335 State of Haryana Vs. Bhajan Lal, an FIR can be quashed. .

6. Instant case if not of that kind.

7. Notwithstanding the law, since none appears for the petitioners at the hearing today, the writ petition is dismissed in default.

8. No costs.

CrI.M.A. 14315/2007

Dismissed as infructuous.

PRADEEP NANDRAJOG, J.

MAY 30, 2016

skb