



\$~74

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 705/2024**

SHUBHAM SINGHAL

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr Yogesh Goel and Mr Yesh Pal
Saini, Advocates for the petitioner.

versus

**THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI
AND ANR.**

..... Respondents

Through: Mr Raj Kumar, APP for the State
with SI Munish Kumar, PS North
Rohini.
Mr Inderjeet, Advocate along with
respondent no.2 in person.

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN**

ORDER
30.01.2024

%

CRL.M.A. 2838/2024

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

CRL.M.C. 705/2024

2. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 CrPC seeking quashing of FIR No.0210/2022 under Sections 308/323 IPC registered at Police Station North Rohini, Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the ground that the parties have arrived at a settlement.

3. Issue notice. The learned APP for the State accepts notice. He submits that since the parties have arrived at a settlement, the State has no objection



in case the FIR in question is quashed.

4. The petitioner, as well as, respondent no. 2 are present in the Court and they have been identified by their respective counsel, as well as, by the Investigating Officer SI Munish Kumar, PS North Rohini.

5. The brief facts of the case are that a call was received by the respondent no.2 from his sister/Preeti Singhal (former wife of petitioner no.1) stating that a scuffle has taken place between her on the one side and her parents-in-law and her husband on the other side. This led to the registration of the aforesaid FIR at the instance of the respondent no.2, who is the brother of the Preeti Singhal.

6. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties arrived at a settlement, terms whereof were reduced in writing in the form of Memorandum of Understanding-cum-Compromise Deed dated 18.08.2023, a copy of which is annexed at page 45 to the present petition.

7. In terms of the said settlement, the parties decided to settle all their disputes and cooperate with each other in quashing of the cross FIRs.

8. The respondent no.2, on a query put by the Court, states that he has no objection in case the FIR is quashed.

9. At this stage, apt would it be to refer to the observations of the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303: (SCC p. 340, para 58)***

“58. Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an



end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor.”

10. In view of the settlement between the parties the ultimate chances of conviction in the case are bleak, therefore, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility.

11. It is, thus, in the interest of justice that the present FIR and all the other proceedings emanating therefrom be quashed.

12. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.0210/2022 under Sections 308/323 IPC registered at Police Station North Rohini, Delhi alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, is quashed.

13. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

14. Order be uploaded on the website of this court.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

JANUARY 30, 2024

MK