

29# \$~

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 2228/2017

M/S SHARP BUSINESS SYSTEMS PRIVATE
LIMITED

..... Petitioner

Represented by: Mr. Manish Miglani, Advocate
with authorised representative
of the petitioner in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Represented by: Mr. R.S. Kundu, Additional
Standing Counsel for State with
Ms. Suman Saharan and Mr.
Bhagat Singh, Advocates with
SI Raghu Kumar, PS North
Rohini.
Authorised representative of
respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

10.09.2018

%

By the present petition, petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No. 406/2014 under Sections 471/420/467/120B/468/406 IPC registered at PS North Rohini, Delhi on the complaint of authorised representative of respondent No.2 and the proceedings pursuant thereto on the ground that the parties have settled the matter.

Learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State on instructions from Investigating Officer submits that the above noted FIR was lodged by Mr. J.C. Behal, husband of Ms. Shashi Behal, respondent No.2 and sole
W.P.(CRL) 2228/2017

Page 1 of 3

proprietor of M/s Anugrah Electronics & Appliances, against the petitioner, which is a company namely M/s Sharp Business Systems (IV) Pvt. Ltd. He states that though two employees of the petitioner were named in the FIR however, during the course of investigation, no personal involvement of the said two employees was revealed and the allegations, if any, were against the petitioner company only.

Respondent No. 2 Ms. Shashi Behal, Sole Proprietor of M/s Anugrah Electronics & Appliances, the complainant in the FIR is represented through Mr. J.C. Behal, copy of the Power of Attorney in whose favour is annexed at pages 77 to 79 of the paper book. Mr. J.C. Behal, power of attorney holder of respondent No. 2 is present in Court and is identified by the Investigating Officer. He states that parties have settled the matter and in terms of the settlement respondent No.2 does not wish to pursue the above-noted FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto.

Petitioner company is represented through Mr. Dipak Kumar Bhagat, copy of the power of attorney in whose favour is annexed at pages 73-75 of the paper book. Mr. Dipak Kumar Bhagat is identified by the learned counsel. He states that in terms of the settlement now there is no claim of respondent No.2 towards the petitioner company. He also affirms the statement of the authorised representative of respondent No.2 and assures that no such issues will arise in future and to show remorse the petitioner undertakes to deposit some costs also.

In view of the fact that the parties have amicably resolved their differences of their own free will, volition and without any coercion and no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the proceedings, it would be

in the interest of justice to quash the abovementioned FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto. There is no legal impediment in quashing the FIR in question.

Consequently, FIR No. 406/2014 under Sections 471/420/467/120B/468/406 IPC registered at PS North Rohini, Delhi and proceedings pursuant thereto are hereby quashed subject to the petitioner depositing a cost of ₹10,000/- with the Chief Minister's Distress Relief Fund, Nagaland in account No.10530527879, IFSC Code No.SBIN0000214, State Bank of India, Kohima Branch within two weeks and receipt thereof will be placed on record.

Parties have signed this order sheet in acknowledgment of their statements made before this Court.

Petition is disposed of. Order dasti.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

SEPTEMBER 10, 2018

‘vn’