

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Order: May 24, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 2804/2019 & CrI.M.A. 11287-88/2019**

MUNNA LAL & ORS. Petitioners
Through: Mr. Mohit Bhardwaj & Ms. Rashi
Pandey, Advocates.

Versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS. Respondents
Through: Mr. Izhar Ahmed, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent
No.1-State wit SI Rajvir Singh.
Respondents No.2 & 3 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 315/2015, under Sections 323/341/354/34 IPC, registered at Police Station New Ashok Nagar, Delhi is sought on the basis of affidavits of 22nd May, 2019 of respondents No.2 and 3 and on the ground that the misunderstanding which led to registration of the FIR in question, now stands cleared between the parties.

Upon notice, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submits that respondents No. 2 and 3 present in the Court, are the complainant party of FIR in question and they have been identified to be so, by SI Rajvir Singh, on the basis of identity proof produced by them.

Respondents No. 2 and 3 present in the Court, submit that the misunderstanding, which led to registration of the FIR in question, now

stands cleared between the parties and now, no grievance against petitioners survives and so, to restore cordiality between the parties, who are neighbors, 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:-

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”.

In the facts and circumstances of this case, I find that continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility as the misunderstanding, which led to registration of the FIR in question, now stands cleared between the parties.

Accordingly, FIR No. 315/2015, under Sections 323/341/354/34 IPC, registered at Police Station New Ashok Nagar, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed qua petitioners.

This petition and applications are accordingly disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

MAY 24, 2019

r

