

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

Date of Order: August 05, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 3818/2019**

NARESH SHARMA @ NARENDER SHARMA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pawan Kumar and
Mr. Kamlesh Sharma, Advocates

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Izhar Ahmad, Additional
Public Prosecutor for respondent-
State with SI Sunny Kumar
Respondent No. 2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

CRL.M.A. 32733/2019 (Exemption)

Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 3818/2019

Quashing of FIR No. 1421/2014, under Sections 498-A/406/34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi is sought on the basis of compromise deed of 4th October, 2018.

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 Sunny Kumar 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 compromised deed of 4th October, 2018 as today, she has received an amount of ₹2,00,000/- by way of demand draft bearing No. 005441 dated 19th July, 2019 drawn on Oriental Bank of Commerce, Branch Swaroop Nagar, Delhi from petitioners. She affirms the contents of her affidavit of 25th May, 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.

Accordingly, FIR No. 1421/2014, under Sections 498-A/406/34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

AUGUST 05, 2019

v



भारतमेव जयते