$~26

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

\+ **W.P.(CRL) 20/2020**

MANPREET SINGH @ MANNU & ORS. ..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kushal Sharma, proxy counsel with petitioners in person.

versus

STATE & ANR. ..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Mayank Sharma, proxy counsel for the State with SI Nagender PS Govindpuri.
R-2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAJNISH BHATNAGAR

O R D E R

% **20.02.2020**

Crl. M.A.No. 83-84/2020 (for exemptions)

Exemptions allowed subject to just exceptions.

The applications stand disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 20/2020

1. Lawyers are abstaining from work today.

2. This is a petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR No.924/2016, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station- Govind Puri, District South-East, Delhi, and all proceedings emanating therefrom.

3. Issue notice. Proxy counsel appearing on behalf of the State enters appearance and accepts notice. Respondent No.2 appears in

person and accepts notice.

4. The brief facts of the case are that the petitioner No.1 and respondent No.2 got married on 08.12.2013 according to Sikh rites and ceremonies and they lived together as wife and husband with each other. After the marriage, some disputes and differences arose between them. On 16.12.2016, respondent No. 2 got the above said FIR registered against the petitioners for causing cruelties and demand of dowry.

5. Counsel for the petitioners submits that during the pendency of the trial, the parties have settled the matter amicably before the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi, in terms of the order dated 13.04.2018. Copy of the same is placed on record. Accordingly, the marriage of the petitioner no.1 and respondent no.2 has already been dissolved by decree of divorce with mutual consent of the parties vide order dated 13.08.2018 passed by learned Court of Ms. Madhu Jain, Judge, Family Court, Saket, New Delhi. Copy of the decree of divorce is placed on record.

6. Respondent No.2 is present in Court today and she has been identified by the IO. The respondent No.2 admits that she has settled the matter amicably with the petitioners. She further submits that the settlement/compromise has taken place voluntarily, without any force, pressure or coercion. Respondent No.2 submits that nothing remains to be adjudicated further between them and she has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

7. Counsel appearing on behalf of the State submits that in view of the settlement between the parties, the State has no objection if the

FIR in question be quashed.

8. Keeping in view the above facts and circumstances, since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties, no useful purpose will be served by keeping the case pending. It will be nothing but abuse of the process of law. Consequentially, this petition is allowed, subject to payment of costs of ₹5,000/-, to be deposited by the petitioners with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee within one 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.924/2016, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at Police Station- Govind Puri, District South-East, Delhi, and the proceedings emanating therefrom shall stand quashed.

9. The present petition stands disposed of accordingly. *Dasti*.

RAJNISH BHATNAGAR, J

FEBRUARY 20, 2020

AK