

\$~11.

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3678/2016**

RAJNI KAUR @ RAJNI NIJHAWAN

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jugal Bagga, Advocate.

versus

STATE & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Srilina Roy, Advocate for
Ms.Nandita Rao, ASC along with SI
Balbir Singh, PS – R.K. Puram, for
the State.

Mr. Atin Chadha, Advocate for and
along with respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIPIN SANGHI

ORDER

23.12.2016

%

Issue notice. Ms. Srilina Roy accepts notice on behalf of the State. Respondent No.2 Bhupendra Singh Solanki is also present with his counsel. He is identified by the I.O. apart from his advocate.

The petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No.275/2016 dated 02.05.2016 registered at PS – R.K. Puram, District – South, under Section 385 IPC and the proceedings arising therefrom. The petition is premised on a compromise arrived at between the complainant/ respondent No.2 and the petitioner. The compromise deed dated 31.08.2016 signed by the parties has

been placed on record.

The submission of learned counsel for the petitioner is that even otherwise, the FIR in question could not have been registered against the petitioner. The allegation in the FIR is that one person, who claimed to be an Advocate by the name Alok Pandey, had called the complainant demanding money on the ground that the petitioner will not take the name of the complainant in her statement under Section 164 Cr.P.C. in respect of FIR No.801/2014 under Section 354D/ 509/ 451/ 34 IPC. It is not even the case of the complainant that the petitioner had made any such call.

The complainant is present in Court. He states that since there is no material to show that the person named to be an Advocate by the name Alok Pandey had been calling on behalf of the petitioner, he does not wish to pursue his complaint against the petitioner and he has no objection to the name of the petitioner being dropped from the aforesaid FIR.

In view of the aforesaid, on account of the settlement arrived at between the respondent No.2 and the petitioner, as also on merit, I am inclined to allow the present petition. Accordingly, the name of the petitioner shall be dropped from the FIR in question and no proceedings shall be undertaken against the petitioner in respect of the said FIR.

The petition stands disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

VIPIN SANGHI, J

DECEMBER 23, 2016

B.S. Rohella