



\$~1

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 195/2024, Crl. M.As. 779-780/2024**

VIPIN GUPTA & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms. Cherry Gupta and Mr. Asim Naeem, Advocates for petitioner Nos. 1 and 2.
Mr. Aditya Varshney and Mr. Deepak Chopra, Advocates for petitioner No. 3 with petitioner No. 3 in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for State with SI Ashish, P.S. Rajouri Garden.
Ms. Dhriti Chhabra, Advocate for respondent No.2 with respondent No.2 in person .

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

16.02.2024

%

1. The present proceedings are instituted under Section 482 Cr.P.C. on behalf of the petitioners seeking quashing of FIR No. 42/2014 registered under Sections 406/420/468/471 IPC at P.S. Rajouri Garden, Delhi on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. The allegations in the present FIR relate to fraud and forgery in respect of an immovable property.
3. Mr. Khanna, learned APP for the State, on instructions, submits that the petitioners are the only accused persons and respondent No.2 is the complainant/victim in the present case.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners and



respondent No. 2 have amicably settled their disputes out of Court and in terms of the said settlement, complainant is now left with no claim or grievance against the petitioners.

5. Petitioners who are present in Court and respondent No.2 who has joined through VC, have been identified by their respective counsel as well as the I.O./SI Ashish, P.S. Rajouri Garden.

6. Petitioners have shown remorse for their conduct and undertake not to repeat the same in future. Respondent No. 2 also states that he has settled the disputes with the petitioners out of his own free will, volition and without any coercion. He further states that he has no objection if the present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed.

7. The parties shall remain bound by the statements made in Court today.

8. In Parbatbhai Aahir and Others v. State of Gujarat and Another reported as **(2017) 9 SCC 641**, it has been held as under:-

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

xxx

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing in so far as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned;

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute;

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants,



the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and...”

9. Similarly, in *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan and Others* reported as **(2019) 5 SCC 403**, it has been held as under:-

“15. Considering the law on the point and the other decisions of this Court on the point, referred to hereinabove, it is observed and held as under:

15.1. That the power conferred Under Section 482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings for the non-compoundable offences Under Section 320 of the Code can be exercised having overwhelmingly and predominantly the civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes and when the parties have resolved the entire dispute amongst themselves;”

10. In view of the above facts and considering that no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the proceedings, it is directed that the aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed, subject to payment of cost of Rs.10,000/- with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority within a period of two weeks from today. The amount so deposited shall be utilized by the DSLSA for providing counselling/psychological support to POCSO victims requiring such assistance.

11. Proof evidencing receipt of deposit shall be filed with the I.O. as well as in Court, failing which Registry shall put the matter before the Court.

12. In case the receipt of deposit of cost is not filed within four weeks, the matter be placed before the Court.



13. A copy of this order be communicated to the Member Secretary, DSLSA for intimation.

14. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

FEBRUARY 16, 2024

ga