

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Order: August 01, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 3652/2019 & CRL.M.A. 32207/2019**

ANISH GUPTA & ORS..Petitioners
Through: Mr. Mukul Gupta & Mr. Ankur
Gupta, Advocates.
Versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Izhar Ahmad, Additional
Public Prosecutor for State with
ASI Rajbir Singh.
Mr. Nitesh Singla, Advocate with
respondent No. 2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 671/2014, under Section 498-A/406/34 of IPC, registered Police Station South Rohini, Delhi is sought on the basis of settlement of 31st May, 2018 and affidavit of respondent No. 2 of 16th July, 2019.

Upon notice, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-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 Rajbir 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 vide aforesaid settlement of 31st May, 2018 and terms thereof have been fully acted upon and she is

happily living with petitioner-husband since last one year. Respondent No. 2 affirms the contents of her affidavit of 16th July, 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.

Consequently, this petition is allowed, subject to costs of ₹10,000/- to be deposited by petitioners with *Prime Minister's National*

Relief Fund within a week 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. 671/2014, under Section 498-A/406/34 of IPC, registered Police Station South Rohini, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom shall stand quashed *qua* petitioners.


This petition and application are accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

AUGUST 01, 2019

p'ma



मह्यमेव जयते