

\$~25

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2256/2017**

PADAM SINGH & ORS Petitioners
Through Mr.Badri Dass, Adv. with
Mr.Mukesh Kumar, Adv. along with
petitioners in person.

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT DELHI) & ANR Respondents
Through Mr.Avi Singh, ASC for State
with SI Prakash, P.S. Kalkaji.
Mr.Dhananjai Jain, Adv. for R-2 with
Mr.Vipul Jain, Director of Respondent
No.2/Complainant, in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD GOEL

ORDER

11.09.2017

%

1. Mr.Vipul Jain, Director of Respondent No.2, appears in person. He is duly identified by the IO SI Prakash.
2. The petitioners have invoked the writ jurisdiction of this court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short 'Cr.PC') for quashing of the FIR bearing No.485/2013, registered on 24.10.2013 against them with Police Station Kalkaji, South East District, Delhi, under Section 408/34 IPC, on the complaint of respondent No.2.
3. Status report has been handed over in Court. The same is taken

on record.

4. Learned ASC through the IO submits that the charge sheet has so far not been filed.
5. Pursuant to the registration of the said FIR, the petitioners No.1 to 5 had filed their different cases before the Labour Court, (Karkardooma Courts), Delhi, being L.I.R. No.192/2015 of Mohit Kumar, L.I.R. No.193/2014 of Gaurav Sharma, L.I.R. No.458/2015 of Amit Bhardwaj, L.I.R. No.403/2015 of Padam Singh and L.I.R. No.473/2015 of Neeraj Saini.
6. The petitioners and respondent no.2 submit that after registration of the said FIR, they had amicably resolved and settled their all disputes by way of Memorandum of Settlement dated 21.07.2017. The copy of the same is placed on record.
7. Mr.Vipul Jain, the Director of the respondent no.2 company states that the respondent no.2 has amicably resolved and settled the disputes with the petitioners. He submits that the respondent no.2 does not want to pursue the said FIR. He submits that the said FIR may be quashed.
8. Learned ASC points out that pursuant to a notice issued to M/s.Sony India Ltd., it was responded that they did not debit/charge the complainant company with regard to the parts replaced by the employees of the complainant company/respondent no. 2. M/s. Sony India Ltd. had also informed the IO that they had issued a warning letter dated 3rd October, 2012 to the complainant company not to indulge in such unethical activities. Mr.Vipul Jain, the Director of the

respondent no.2, confirms having received the warning letter dated 3rd October, 2012 from M/s. Sony India Ltd. Learned ASC submits that after issuance of warning letter, M/s.Sony India Ltd. does not want to pursue the matter.

9. Since the parties have amicably settled their all disputes, no fruitful purpose would be served in further pursuing with the said FIR. Hence, to secure ends of justice, the FIR bearing No.485/2013, registered on 24.10.2013 with Police Station Kalkaji, South East District, Delhi, under Section 408/34 IPC and proceedings arising out of the same are hereby quashed.
10. The petition is disposed of accordingly.
11. Dasti.

VINOD GOEL, J.

SEPTEMBER 11, 2017/jitender