

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

Date of Order: May 02, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 2095/2019**

SHAUKEEN CHAODHARY

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arif Ahmed Khan, Advocate.

Versus

THE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Izhar Ahmed, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent
No.1-State with ASI Puran Singh
Respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Crl.M.A. 8333/2019

Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 2095/2019

Quashing of FIR No.710/2014, under Sections 406/498-A/34 of IPC and under Section 4 of the *Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961*, registered at Police Station Gokalpuri, North-East Delhi is sought on the basis of affidavit of 6th March, 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 ASI Sanwal Ram on the basis of identity proof produced by her.

Respondent No.2, present in the Court, affirms the contents of her affidavit of 6th March, 2019 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 proceedings, 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.710/2014, under Sections 406/498-A/34 of IPC and under Section 4 of the *Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961*, registered at

Police Station Gokalpuri, North-East Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed qua petitioners.

This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

MAY 02, 2019

r

