

37# \$~

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3530/2016**

**ASHISH PAUL SINGH**

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. R.S. Chaggar and Mr.  
Sajan Arora, Advocates with  
petitioner in person.

versus

**STATE & ANR.**

..... Respondents

Represented by: Ms. Rajni Gupta, APP for the  
State with SI Lokender Tyagi,  
7<sup>th</sup> BN RTS.  
Respondent No.2 in person.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA**

**ORDER**

%

**23.09.2016**

**Crl. M.A. No. 14920/2016 (Exemption)**

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

**CRL.M.C. 3530/2016 and Crl. M.A. No. 14919/2016 (Stay)**

By the present petition the petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No. 24/2013 under Sections 498A/325/341 IPC registered at PS C.R. Park, Delhi on the complaint of Respondent No.2 and the proceedings pursuant thereto on the ground that the parties have settled the matter.

Learned APP for the State on instructions from the Investigating Officers submits that in the above noted FIR the petitioner is the only accused and the respondent No.2 is the only complainant/victim in the above noted FIR.

***CRL.M.C. 3530/2016***

***Page 1 of 3***

The complainant/Respondent No. 2 Ms. Anju Austa who is present in Court and is identified by the Investigating Officer states that she has settled the matter with the Petitioner and his mother Smt. Rajinder Kaur and a memorandum of understanding dated 12<sup>th</sup> February, 2014 has been arrived at between the parties, copy whereof is at pages 31 to 39 of the paper-book. She states that in terms of the settlement divorce by mutual consent has been granted between the petitioner and the respondent No.2. Further the two minor children, that is, Rayan Singh and Arjun Singh would live with the respondent No.2 however, the guardianship will be with both the parties and the petitioner will have visitation rights as per the terms of the settlement. The petitioner and his mother would also provide for the maintenance for the respondent No.2 and the two children as agreed by the terms of the settlement. Respondent No.2 undertakes to abide by the terms of memorandum of understanding dated 12<sup>th</sup> February, 2014 and she does not want to pursue the abovementioned FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto.

Petitioner who is present in Court and is identified by the learned counsel affirms the statement made by respondent No.2 and states that he would abide by the terms of the memorandum of understanding dated 12<sup>th</sup> February, 2014

In view of the fact that the parties have amicably resolved their differences of their own free will, volition and without any coercion and no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the proceedings, rather the same would create further acrimony between them, it would be in the interest of justice to quash the abovementioned FIR and the proceedings

pursuant thereto. There is no legal impediment in quashing the FIR in question.

Consequently, FIR No. 24/2013 under Sections 498A/325/341 IPC registered at PS C.R. Park, Delhi and proceedings pursuant thereto are hereby quashed.

Parties have signed this order sheet in acknowledgment of their statements made before this Court.

The petition and the application disposed of. Order dasti.

**MUKTA GUPTA, J.**

**SEPTEMBER 23, 2016**  
**‘vn’**