

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

Date of Order: August 07, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 3899/2019**

NIKHIL BABBAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. H.N. Pandey and Mr. Pushkar
Walia, Advocates.

Versus

STATE (NCT DELHI) & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Izhar Ahmad, Additional
Public Prosecutor for State with SI
Manju Singh
Respondent No. 2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 109/2019 under Sections 354/509/506/34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Geeta Colony, Delhi is sought on the basis of affidavit of 3rd August, 2019 of respondent No. 2 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 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 Manju Singh, on the basis of identity proof produced by her.

Respondent No. 2 present in the Court, affirms the contents of her affidavit of 3rd August, 2019 and submits that the misunderstanding, which led to registration of the FIR in question, now stands cleared between the parties and now, no grievance against petitioner survives and so, to restore cordiality between the parties, who are relatives, 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”.

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

within eight weeks 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. 109/2019 under Sections 354/509/506/34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Geeta Colony, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom shall stand quashed.

This petition is accordingly disposed of.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

AUGUST 07, 2019

v



न्यायमेव जयते