

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Order: March 13, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 1351/2019 and CRL.M.As. 5396-5397/2019**

SONU & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Karam Chand Jha, Advocate

Versus

STATE AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. M.S. Oberoi, Additional
Public Prosecutor for State with
ASI Suresh Kumar
Mr. Satyam Singh, Advocate with
Respondent No. 2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 333/2011, under Sections 406/34 of *IPC* and under Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, registered at police station New Usmanpur, Delhi is sought on the basis of *Mediated Settlement* of 5th September, 2017 (*Annexure A-1*) reached between the parties.

Upon notice, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent No.1-State submits that respondent No.2, present in the Court, is the complainant/ first-informant of FIR in question and she has been identified to be so, by ASI Suresh Kumar on the basis of identity proof produced by her.

Respondent No.2 present in the Court, submits that the dispute

between the parties has been amicably resolved vide aforesaid *Mediated Settlement* of 5th September, 2017 (*Annexure A-1*) and terms thereof have been fully acted upon. Respondent No. 2 affirms the contents of her affidavit of 02nd May, 2018 filed in support of this petition and submits that now no dispute with petitioners survives and so, the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be brought to an end.

Supreme Court in *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Vs. State of Gujarat* (2017) 9 SCC 641 has reiterated the parameters for exercising inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR / criminal complaint, which are as under:-

“16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice;”

Since the subject matter of this FIR is essentially matrimonial, which now stands mutually and amicably settled between parties, therefore, continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility.

Accordingly, FIR No. 333/2011, under Sections 406/34 of *IPC* and under Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, registered at police station

New Usmanpur, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

This petition and applications are accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

**(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE**

MARCH 13, 2019

p'ma

