

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Order: March 25, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 1569/2019 & CRL.M.A. 6275/2019**

RAHUL GUPTA & ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Vineet Mehta, Advocate

Versus

STATE & ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. M.P. Singh, Additional Public
Prosecutor for State with SI
Pradeep Singh
Ms. Aarti Tyagi, Advocate with
Respondent No. 2 in person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 754/2015, under Sections 498-A/406/323/354A/506/34 of IPC, registered at police station Mahindra Park, Delhi is sought on the basis of affidavit of 19th February, 2019 of respondent No. 2.

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 SI Pradeep Singh 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 as today, she has received an amount of ₹2,80,000/- by way of demand draft bearing No.567084 dated 20th March, 2019 drawn on Kotak Mahindra Bank, Karol Bagh Branch, Delhi from petitioners and that divorce by mutual consent has been already granted by the family court on 9th October, 2018. She affirms the contents of her affidavit of 19th February, 2019 supporting 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, this petition is allowed subject to costs of ₹10,000/- to be deposited by petitioners with *Prime Minister's National Relief Fund* within two weeks from today. Upon placing on record the proof of deposit of costs within a week thereafter and handing over its copy to the Investigating Officer, FIR No. 754/2015, under Sections 498-A/406/323/354A/506/34 of IPC, registered at police station Mahindra Park, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom shall stand quashed.

This petition and application are accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

MARCH 25, 2019
p'ma

भारतमेव जयते