

\$~38

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4249/2017**

AMIT CHAWLA & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Akshay Verma, Adv. along with
petitioners in person.

Versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ORS Respondents

Through: Mr. M.S. Oberoi, APP for State with
SI Pritosh Rathee, P.S. Kirti Nagar.
Mr. Abhinav Singh, Mr. Sourabh
Sharma, Advs. for R-2 & R-3 along
with R-2 & R-3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

23.10.2017

Petitioner nos. 2 and 3 are wife and mother of petitioner no.1. Present FIR No. 245/2016 under Section 23 of the Juvenile Justice (Care and Protection of Children) Act, 2015, Section 3/14 of the Child Labour (Prohibition & Regulation) and Section 374 IPC was registered against the petitioners at police station Kirti Nagar, on the complaint of respondent no.2. It is stated that respondent no.2 was working with the petitioners as a Domestic Help. Petitioners had hired the respondent no.2 through a placement agency. Disputes arose with regard to the payment of salary which had led to registration of present FIR.

It is submitted that petitioners and respondent nos. 2 and 3 have

settled their disputes amicably before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Court, Delhi on 22nd September, 2017, therefore, aforesaid FIR, which is at the investigation stage, may be quashed.

Respondent no. 2 is present in Court along with her mother, that is, respondent no.3. They have been identified by SI Pritosh Rathee of police station Kirti Nagar. Respondent no.2 has given her age as 18 years. Her statement, on oath, was recorded before the trial court on 27th September, 2017 wherein she has given her age as 18 years. In terms of the settlement, petitioners have paid ₹4,86,432/- to the respondent no.2 through two demand drafts, photocopies whereof have been placed on record. Respondent no.2 submits that entire settled amount stands paid and she has no objection if FIR is quashed.

Keeping in mind the facts detailed hereinabove, in the interest of justice, aforesaid FIR is quashed in view of the settlement.

Petition is disposed of in the above terms. Miscellaneous application is disposed of as infructuous.

Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

OCTOBER 23, 2017

ga