

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Order: March 27, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 1617/2019 & CRL.M.A. 6476/2019**

RAJESH KUMAR & ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Rohit Sharma and Ms.
Namrata Sharma, Advocates

Versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Izhar Ahmad, Additional
Public Prosecutor for State with SI
Harish Kumar
Ms. Devki Nandan, Advocate with
Respondent No. 2 in person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 102/2017, under Sections 498-A/406/34 of IPC, registered at police station Swaroop Nagar, Delhi is sought on the basis of settlement of 2nd April, 2018 (*Annexure P-2*) 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 SI Harish 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 as today, she has received an amount of ₹65,000/- by way of two demand drafts bearing Nos. 004999 & 005014 dated 24th January, 2019 & 22nd February, 2019 drawn on HDFC Bank, Nissing Branch, Haryana from petitioners and that divorce by mutual consent has been already granted by the family court on 18th October, 2018. She affirms the contents of her affidavit of 9th January, 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 ₹25,000/- 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. 102/2017, under Sections 498-A/406/34 of IPC, registered at police station Swaroop Nagar, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom shall stand quashed.

This petition and application are accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

MARCH 27, 2019

p'ma