



\$~58

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1226/2024**

SATISH KUMAR & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Varun Tyagi, Advocate
alongwith petitioners in person.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI)& ANR. Respondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for
the State with W/SI Arti, P.S.
R.K. Puram.
Mr. Ravi Sharma, Advocate for R-2
alongwith R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

%

15.02.2024

CRL.M.A. 4856/2024 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. The application is accordingly disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 1226/2024

3. The present petition filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of FIR No. 280/2021, under Sections 354D/354A/354/506 of the IPC, registered at P.S. R.K. Puram and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Akansha Garg, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court-02, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that the latter and respondent no. 2 works in the same office and on account of



some misunderstanding, the present FIR was registered at the instance of respondent no. 2. It is further submitted that during the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, the petitioners and respondent no. 2 have settled their dispute, pursuant to which, respondent no. 2 has no objection, if the present FIR and subsequent chargesheet are quashed.

5. Petitioners and complainant/respondent no. 2 are present before the Court and have been duly identified by their respective counsel, as well as the Investigating Officer, W/SI Arti, P.S. R.K. Puram.

6. The complainant/respondent No.2 states that the matter has been settled with the petitioners and she has no objection if the FIR is quashed.

7. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned APP for the State also has no objection if the present FIR is quashed, subject to cost.

8. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

“61. ... In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

9. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and the fact that the parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 280/2021, under Sections 354D/354A/354/506 of the IPC, registered at P.S. R.K. Puram and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet



pending before the Court of Ms. Akansha Garg, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court-02, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.

10. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 280/2021, under Sections 354D/354A/354/506 of the IPC, registered at P.S. R.K. Puram and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Akansha Garg, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court-02, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi, is hereby quashed, subject to the cost of Rs. 15,000/- each to be deposited by the petitioners as a consolidated sum of Rs. 30,000/- with Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee within 07 working days. Let the aforesaid amount be utilised towards counselling/psychological support to be provided to POCSO victims requiring such assistance.

11. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

12. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

FEBRUARY 15, 2024/bsr