

\$~52

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

+ CRL.M.C. 892/2020

VINOD KUMAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Sitwat Nabi and Mr. Amrit Singh, Proxy Counsels for Mr. Sidharth Joshi and Mr. Rajat Prajapati, Advs. with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Dr. M.P. Singh, APP for State with SI Jitender, P.S. Sonia Vihar.
Respondent no.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

% **20.02.2020**

1. Lawyers are abstaining from work today.
2. The present proceedings are instituted seeking quashing of FIR No. 215/2013 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC and Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 registered at P.S. Sonia Vihar on the ground of settlement having been arrived at between the petitioner and respondent no. 2.
3. Learned APP for the State submits that the charge sheet has been filed against the petitioner as well as other accused persons under the aforesaid sections however, only petitioner has been summoned by the trial court. It is further submitted that respondent no.2 is the only the complainant/victim.
4. It is submitted that the petitioner (husband) and respondent no.2 (wife) have started living together after resolving their differences before the

Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi on 08.06.2016, therefore, the aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings emanating therefrom may be quashed.

5. The petitioner as well as respondent no. 2 are present in Court and have been identified by the Investigating Officer. Respondent no.2 submits that she has settled her disputes with the petitioner out of her own free will and without any undue force, pressure or coercion. She further submits that she has been living with the petitioner for the last four years and presently, she has no grievance against the petitioner. She further states that in view of the settlement, she is not willing to pursue the present FIR any further and the same may be quashed.

6. Keeping in mind that the husband and wife have been living together for the past four years after ironing out their differences and that respondent no.2 does not wish to pursue the FIR any further. In view of the settlement, no fruitful purpose would be served to keep them entangled in the present criminal proceedings. Accordingly, in the interest of justice, the aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

7. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

8. *Dasti.*

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

FEBRUARY 20, 2020

ga