

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Order: August 07, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 3645/2019 & CRL.M.A. 32194/2019**

JASJEET SINGH & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Ravinder Kaur & Mr.
Himanshu Bhasin, Advocates.

Versus

STATE & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Izhar Ahmad Additional
Public Prosecutor for State with
ASI Rajender Singh.
Mr. Pushpreet Singh, Advocate
with Respondent No. 2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 140/2017, under Sections 498A/406/34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Tilak Nagar, Delhi is sought on the basis of Settlement of 3rd August, 2017 reached between the parties and affidavit of 24th April, 2019 of respondent No. 2.

Upon notice, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submits that respondent No. 2, who is present in Court, is the complainant of FIR in question and she has been identified to be so, by ASI Rajender 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 ₹50,000/- by way of demand draft bearing No. 010565, dated 28th May, 2019 drawn on HDFC Bank, Branch Vikas Puri G-Block, Delhi. Respondent No. 2 affirms the contents of her affidavit of 24th April, 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 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.

Consequentially, FIR No. 140/2017, under Sections 498A/406/34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Tilak Nagar, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed qua petitioners.

This petition and application are accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

AUGUST 07, 2019
p'ma

