

\$~9

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CRL.M.C. 1098/2019

MAYANK NAHAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Petitioner in person with Mr. Ajay
Kr., Advocate.

versus

THE STATE & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for State
with ASI Rajesh, PS Anand Parbat.
R-2 in person with Mr. Vipin Singh,
Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE ANU MALHOTRA

ORDER

%

04.03.2020

Vide the present petition , the petitioner seeks the quashing of the FIR No.155/2013, PS Anand Parbat under Sections 324/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 submitting to the effect that a settlement has been arrived at between the parties and no useful purpose would be served by the continuation of the proceedings in the present FIR.

The Investigation Officer of the case is present and has identified the petitioner as being the sole accused who has been charge sheeted in the matter and in reply to a specific Court query has stated that the other co-accused was not arrested as he could not be traced out. He has also identified the respondent no.2 as being the

complainant of the said FIR.

The respondent no.2 has produced her original proof of identity, photocopy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/A. The respondent no.2 in her deposition on oath by the Court has affirmed having signed her affidavit in support of the averments made in the petition at points A & B on Ex.CW2/B as well as the compromise deed dated 29.12.2018 as visible at point A on Ex.CW2/C, qua which she states that she has signed these documents voluntarily of her own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter and states that in view of the settlement arrived at between her and the petitioner, she does not oppose the prayer made by the petitioner seeking the quashing of the FIR No.155/2013, PS Anand Parbat under Sections 324/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor does she want the petitioner to be punished in relation thereto.

On behalf of the State, there is no opposition to the prayer made by the petitioner seeking the quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

In as much as, the injuries sustained by the injured as per the MLC bearing No.41306 of the Lady Hardinge Medical College and Smt. S.K. Hospital indicates that the nature of injuries were opined to be simple, in view of the deposition of the respondent no.2 and the non-opposition on behalf of the State, for maintenance of peace and harmony between the parties it is considered appropriate to put a quietus to the litigation between the parties in relation to the FIR in question.

In view thereof, FIR No.155/2013, PS Anand Parbat under Sections 324/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioner are thus, quashed.

The petition is disposed of.

ANU MALHOTRA, J

MARCH 04, 2020
'neha chopra'

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI: NEW DELHI

9

CRL.M.C. 1098/2019

MAYANK NAHAL Vs. STATE & ANR.

04.03.2020

CW-1 ASI Rajesh, PS Anand Parbat.

ON S.A.

I identify the petitioner as being the sole accused charge sheeted in relation to FIR No.155/2013, PS Anand Parbat under Sections 324/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and I also identify the respondent no.2 as being the complainant of the said FIR.

The other co-accused in the matter was not traced out.

RO & AC
04.03.2020

ANU MALHOTRA, J

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI: NEW DELHI

9

CRL.M.C. 1098/2019

MAYANK NAHAL Vs. STATE & ANR.

04.03.2020

**CW-2 Ms. Dolly, w/o Sh. Rakesh, age 30 years, r/o h.No.49B, DDA Flat,
Mata Sundari Road, New Delhi.**

ON S.A.

I have brought my original proof of identity, photocopy of which is on the record as Ex.CW2/A.

My affidavit in support of the averments made in the petition bears my signatures at points A & B on Ex.CW2/B. The compromise deed dated 29.12.2018 also bears my signatures as visible at point A on Ex.CW2/C, I have signed these documents voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter. In view of the settlement arrived at between me and the petitioner, I do not oppose the prayer made by the petitioner seeking the quashing of the FIR No.155/2013, PS Anand Parbat under Sections 324/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 nor do I want the petitioner to be punished in relation thereto.

I have studied till Standard VI and I run a boutique.

I have made my statement after understanding the implications thereof, voluntarily of my own accord without any duress, coercion or pressure from any quarter.

RO & AC
04.03.2020

ANU MALHOTRA, J