

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Order: May 20, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 2695/2019 & CRL.M.As. 10781-10782/2019**

SHABUDDIN & ORSPetitioners
Through: Manoj Kumar Sharma, Advocate.

Versus

STATE & ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Neelam Sharma, Additional
Public Prosecutor for State with SI
Amrendra.
Respondent No. 2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 438/2011, under Sections 498A/406/34 of IPC & Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 registered at Police Station Nand Nagri, Delhi is sought on the basis of settlement of 12th March, 2014 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 Amrendra 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 ₹75,000/- from petitioners. She affirms the contents of her affidavit of 6th May, 2019 supporting this petition and submits that now no dispute with petitioners survives and so, to restore cordiality between the parties, 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. 438/2011, under Sections 498A/406/34 of IPC & Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 registered at Police Station Nand Nagri, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed qua petitioners.

This petition and applications are accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

MAY 20, 2019
p'ma

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE



नित्यमेव जयते