

\$~78 & 79

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

%

Judgment delivered on: 06.09.2018

+ CRL.M.C. 4510/2018
VISHAL GUPTA Petitioner

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondents

+ CRL.M.C. 4511/2018
RAM VILAS GUPTA & ORS Petitioners

versus

STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioners : Mr. Keshav Verma, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr. Kewal Singh Ahuja, APP for the
State.
SI Devi Lal, PS Maurya Enclave.

CORAM:-

HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA

JUDGMENT

06.09.2018

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

Crl. M.A. 31480/2018 (Exemption) in CRL.M.C. 4510/2018

Crl. M.A. 31483/2018 (Exemption) in CRL.M.C. 4511/2018

Exemptions are allowed subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 4510/2018 & CRL.M.C. 4511/2018

1. The petitioner in Crl.M.C. 4510/2018 seeks quashing of FIR

No.286/2014 under Sections 354/354-D/506/509 IPC, Police Station Maurya Enclave. The petitioners in Crl.M.C. 4511/2018 seek quashing of FIR No.893/2014 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, Police Station Maurya Enclave, based on a settlement

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that Ms. Jyoti Singhal, sister-in-law of the respondent No.2/complainant though named in the FIR but was not chargesheeted. He further submits that she has also signed the Memorandum of Settlement between the parties.

3. The subject FIR emanates out of discord between the daughter-in-law and the family of the husband. There is no dispute between the husband and wife.

4. Learned counsel for the parties submit that the parties have settled their disputes and Memorandum of Understanding-cum-Compromise Deed-cum-Family Settlement Deed dated 29.05.2018 has been executed. Learned counsel for the parties submit that the settlement is a holistic settlement between the entire family and that all disputes between the parties have been fully and finally settled and now there is no dispute pending between the parties.

5. Learned counsel for the parties further submit that civil proceedings, which were initiated between the parties, have already been settled in terms of the settlement and appropriate decree has been

passed.

6. Respondent No.2 is present in person and is identified by the Investigating Officer. She submits that she has settled her disputes with the petitioners and does not wish to prosecute the criminal complaints any further and has no objection to the quashing of the subject FIRs.

7. In view of the fact that the parties have resolved their disputes and respondent No. 2 does not wish to press her complaints, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor. It would be expedient to quash the subject FIR and the consequent proceedings emanating therefrom.

8. In view of the above, the petitions are allowed. FIR No.286/2014 under Sections 354/354-D/506/509 IPC, Police Station Maurya Enclave and FIR No.893/2014 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC, Police Station Maurya Enclave and the consequent proceedings emanating there from are quashed.

9. Order *Dasti* under the signatures of the Court Master.

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J

SEPTEMBER 06, 2018/st