

\$~56

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

% Judgment delivered on: 28.09.2018
+ CRL.M.C. 4963/2018

MANDEEP SEHRAWAT & ANR. Petitioners

versus

STATE & ANR. Respondents

Advocates who appeared in this case:

For the Petitioner : Mr.Vivek Luthra, Advocate.

For the Respondents: Mr.Hirein Sharma, APP for the State with SI
Narender Singh, P.S.Vasant Kunj (S)
Mr. J.S.Arya, Adv. for R-2 with R-2 in person.

**CORAM:-
HON'BLE MR JUSTICE SANJEEV SACHDEVA**

**JUDGMENT
28.09.2018**

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J. (ORAL)

Crl. M.A. 33122/2018 (Exemption)

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 4963/2018 & Crl.M.A.33123/2018

1. Petitioners seek quashing of FIR No. 167 of 2016 under Section 354/354B/506/34 of the IPC registered at Police Station Vasant Kunj South, Delhi.

2. Subject FIR is an offshoot of matrimonial dispute between the

families of the petitioners as well as respondent No.2. Petitioner No.1 is the son-in-law of respondent No.2 and petitioner No.2 is the father of petitioner No.1. There were other two connected FIRs being FIR No.69/2016 under Section 498/406/34 IPC, Police Station Mansarovar Park and FIR No.17/2016 under Section 353/341/509/34 IPC, Police Station Seemapuri. Said two FIRs have already been quashed in other proceeding initiated between the parties.

3. Exemption from personal appearance is sought for petitioner No.2 on the ground that he is permanently residing in United States and he has executed a Special Power of Attorney in favour of his daughter on 17.09.2018.

4. In view of the said averments, the petitioner No.2 is granted exemption from personal appearance.

5. Settlement was entered into between the parties before Delhi Mediation Centre, Patiala House Courts on 20.03.2018. The settlement amount of Rs. 50,00,000/- has already been paid to daughter of respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 has no objection to the quashing of the subject FIR.

6. Respondent No.2 is present in Court, represented by her counsel and identified by the Investigating Officer. She submits that she does not wish to press the complaint against the petitioners any further and has no objection to quashing of the subject FIR.

7. In view of the fact that the parties have resolved their disputes and respondent No. 2 does not wish to press their complaint, 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 petition is allowed. FIR No. 167 of 2016 under Section 354/354B/506/34 of the IPC registered at Police Station Vasant Kunj South, Delhi and the consequent proceedings emanating there from are, accordingly quashed.

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

SEPTEMBER 28, 2018
rk

SANJEEV SACHDEVA, J