

\$~2

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4340/2022**

PRASHANT KUMAR JHA & ANR. Petitioners

Through: **Mr. R. K. Mishra, Adv.**

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ORS. Respondent

Through: **Mr. Amit Sahni, APP for the State
with Mr. Vaibhav Mishra, Adv. with
SI Sandeep Singh, PS Laxmi Nagar.**

%

Date of Decision: 2nd December, 2022

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SHARMA

J U D G M E N T

DINESH KUMAR SHARMA, J. (Oral)

1. The present petition has been filed for quashing of FIR No. 103/2010 under Sections 323/342/34 IPC, Sections 23/26 of JJ Act and Sections 3/14 of Child Labour Act registered as PS Shakarpur, East Delhi on the statement of the complainant Chandni daughter of Mr. Bantu. In the FIR, it was alleged by the complainant that she was brought by Prashant and his wife Chanda and they used to take the household works from her and also used to harass and torture her. It was also alleged that accused persons used to keep the complainant in lock and key during the time

they used to be at the office.

2. After the investigation, the charge-sheet under Sections 323/342/370/374/506/34 IPC, Sections 23/26 of JJ Act and Sections 3/14 of Child Labour Act was filed. The matter is pending trial before the learned Trial Court.
3. The present petition has been filed for quashing of the FIR No. 103/2010 under Sections 323/342/34 IPC, Sections 23/26 of JJ Act and Sections 3/14 of Child Labour Act registered as PS Shakarpur, East Delhi on the ground that the parties have settled the matter at their own free will and without any pressure or undue influence.
4. The complainant is present in the Court. I have interacted with the complainant. The complainant states that her mother used to work with the parents of the Prashant Kumar Jha at Devghar, Jharkhand. The complainant states that in fact she had to come to Delhi for her education. She further states that in fact, she does not know about the contents of the FIR and it had happened out of some confusion. The complainant stated before this Court that Prashant and Chanda are like her brother and sister-in-law.
5. The mother of the complainant is also present. She also states that she has no complaint with anybody and the present FIR seems to have been lodged out of some communication gap.
6. I have also interacted with the accused persons Prashant and Chanda. Smt. Chanda has stated that she has done PHD and is now doing teaching work.
7. The matter is still pending trial before the learned Trial Court and it has been informed that only two three witnesses have been examined. The

FIR is of 2010. The complainant is now married and is having children and is settled at Devghar, Jharkhand.

8. I consider that to secure the ends of justice, it would be desirable, if the quietus is put to the present proceedings. Thus, in the interest of justice, the present FIR No. 103/2010 under Sections 323/342/34 IPC, Sections 23/26 of JJ Act and Sections 3/14 of Child Labour Act registered as PS Shakarpur, East Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioners are thus quashed.
9. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of accordingly.

DINESH KUMAR SHARMA, J

DECEMBER 2, 2022

Pallavi

न्यायमेव जयते