

\$~41

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 6056/2019**

RAHUL

..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Gautam Bahl, Advocate

versus

STATE & ANR.

..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Kewal Singh Ahuja, APP for State
With SI Jyoti Mandir Marg.
Mr.Ranjay K. Dubey, Adv for R-2
with R-2 in person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER
% **10.02.2020**

The other injured in the matter is not impleaded as a party on the record.

Javed Ali is also present.

The petitioner vide the present petition seeks quashing of FIR No.102/18 PS Mandir Marg, registered under Sections 354/354(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 submitting to the effect that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties and in view of the settlement, the prosecutrix does not oppose the prayer made by the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR No.102/18 PS Mandir Marg, registered under Sections 354/354(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and no useful purpose would be served by the continuation of the proceedings in the FIR in question.

A bare perusal of the averments made in the FIR as well as the statement made by the prosecutrix arrayed as the respondent No.2 to the present petition under Section 164 of the Cr.P.C. before the learned Metropolitan Magistrate on 28.8.2018, prima facie brings forth allegations of gross mental depravity against the accused persons.

In the circumstances, it is not considered appropriate in terms of the verdict of the Supreme Court in *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur & Ors. V.State of Gujarat And Another*; (2017) 9 SCC 641 to grant the prayer made by the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR No.102/18 PS Mandir Marg, registered under Sections 354/354(A)/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.

The petition is declined.

Nothing stated herein above shall however amount to any observations on the merits or demerits of the trial before the learned Trial Court.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

FEBRUARY 10, 2020/SV