

\$~18

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
% Judgment delivered on: 21.06.2017

+ W.P.(C) 1826/2017

VIKAS ANAND & ORS

..... Petitioners

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ORS

..... Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr. Sandeep Khatri, Advocate with petitioners in person.

For the Respondents : Mr. Sanjay Lao, Advocate with respondent Nos.1 and 3 in person.
SI Sharda Maggo, PS Mandir Marg.
respondent Mr. Biswajit Kumar Patra, Advocate for respondent No.2 with
No.2 in person.

CORAM:-
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

CRL.M.A. 10097/2017 (exemption)

Exemption is allowed subject to all just exceptions.

W.P.(CRL) 1826/2017

1. The petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No.129/16, under Section 498-A/406/34 IPC, Police Station Mandir Marg, Delhi.
2. It is submitted that the marriage between the petitioner No.1 and the respondent No.2 was solemnized as per Hindu rites and ceremonies on 25.02.2015.
3. Due to differences of temperament and, on account of certain other

circumstances, parties could not adjust and continue living together.

4. A complaint was made by the respondent No.2 and the FIR No.129/16, under Section 498-A/406/34 IPC, Police Station Mandir Marg, Delhi, was registered against the petitioners.

5. The parties have since then resolved the disputes with the intervention of the common relatives and friends.

6. All disputes have been resolved and the petitioner No.1 and the respondent No.2 are living together happily. They also have a child from the wedlock.

7. Respondent No.2 has also made a statement before the Court of Additional Chief Metropolitan Magistrate that they have started living together and that she does not wish to proceed further with her complaint and the consequent FIR.

8. The petitioner No.1, who is present in Court, assures that he shall keep his wife – the respondent No.2 happy and in future shall not give any cause for concern.

9. The respondent No.2 who is present in court is identified by Sub Inspector Sharda Maggo and is also represented by a counsel.

10. In view of the fact that the parties have now reconciled and are living together happily and have a minor daughter from their wedlock and the respondent No.2 does not wish to proceed further with the complaint and the consequent FIR, I am satisfied that this is a fit case for exercise of extraordinary jurisdiction of the Court in quashing the FIR.

11. Consequently, the FIR No.129/16, under Section 498-A/406/34 IPC, Police Station Mandir Marg, Delhi is quashed.

12. *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

13. The petition is accordingly disposed of.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J
(Vacation Judge)

JUNE 21, 2017
st

