



\$~16

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

+ CRL.M.C. 838/2023

MANSOOR ALAM @ MANSUR ALAMPetitioner

Through: Mr.Akhilesh Kumar, Advocate for
petitioner with petitioner in person
Mr.Sunil P., Mr.Sandeep Kaushik, Ms.Rakhi,
Advocates for *Ravinder Kumar*/accused

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI)Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with SI Rakesh
Ms. Nidhi Gupta, Advocate for respondent No.2
with respondent No.2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

18.07.2024

1. The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No.1091/2014 registered under Sections 420/467/468/471/34 IPC at P.S. Kanjhawala on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. The allegations in the FIR relate to the petitioner cheating the complainant of his money in the name of selling the land.
3. Learned APP for the State submits that in the present case the petitioner is one of the accused persons and respondent No.2 is the only complainant/victim. It is further submitted that the chargesheet has been filed against the present petitioner and the co-accused namely *Ravinder*



Vashisht.

4. Learned counsels for the parties submit that the parties were referred to the mediation centre where all of them including *Ravinder Vashisht*/co-accused have reached at an amicable settlement vide Settlement Agreement dated 27.05.2024 before the Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre. It is further submitted that out of the settlement amount, the balance amount of Rs.1,50,000/- and Rs.75,000/- is being paid today through demand drafts bearing No.874537 dated 18.07.2024 drawn on Punjab National Bank, Jharoda Kalan, New Delhi and No.719617 dated 15.05.2024 drawn on Union Bank, Janakpuri. In terms of the settlement, respondent No.2 is now left with no claim or grievance whatsoever against the petitioner and the co-accused.

5. The petitioner, co-accused and respondent No.2, who are present in the Court, have been identified by their respective counsels and the Investigating Officer.

6. Respondent No.2 states that he has entered into the aforesaid Settlement Agreement 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 subject to encashment of the aforesaid demand drafts.

7. Learned counsels for the parties submit that no other proceedings are pending between the parties.

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

9. 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...”

10. 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;”

11. In view of the above facts and since no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the present criminal proceedings, it is directed that the



aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed against the petitioner and the co-accused, subject to payment of cost of Rs.5,000/- by each petitioner and the co-accused to be deposited with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority (A/c No.: 18580110053263, Bank: UCO BANK, Branch: Rouse Avenue, IFSC: UCBA0003364) within a period of four weeks from today. The amount so deposited shall be utilized by the Delhi State Legal Services Authority for providing counselling/psychological support to POCSO victims requiring such assistance.

12. Proof evidencing receipt of deposit shall be filed with the I.O. In case the receipt of payment of cost is not filed within the stipulated time, the I.O. shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application.

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

14. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Member Secretary, Delhi State Legal Services Authority for information.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

JULY 18, 2024

na