



\$~75

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1993/2024**

SH. JAI PRAKASH CHAUHAN & ANR. Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rahul Thakur, Adv. with
petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI) & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for
State with SI Ankur, P.S. Nihal Vihar.
Mr. Shivam Sharma, Adv. for R-2
with R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

% **12.03.2024**

CRL.M.A. 7687/2024 (Exemption)

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

CRL.M.C. 1993/2024

3. The present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of FIR No. 754/2020, under Sections 406/420/506/120B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Nihal Vihar and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Mr. P. Bhargav Rao, learned Metropolitan Magistrate -03, West District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
4. During the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, the matter has been settled before Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, *vide* Settlement



dated 26.09.2023. The copy of the aforesaid settlement dated 26.09.2023 is on record (Annexure E).

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, with SI Ankur, P.S. Nihal Vihar.

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. She further states that all the terms of the agreement have been complied with. The parties further undertake to abide by their reciprocal obligations as per the terms of the Settlement Deed dated 26.09.2023.

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

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. 754/2020, under Sections 406/420/506/120B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Nihal Vihar and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet



pending before the Court of Mr. P. Bhargav Rao, learned Metropolitan Magistrate -03, West District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

10. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. FIR No. 754/2020, under Sections 406/420/506/120B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Nihal Vihar and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Mr. P. Bhargav Rao, learned Metropolitan Magistrate -03, West District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, is hereby quashed subject to a cost of Rs. 15,000/- each to be deposited by the petitioners as a consolidated sum of Rs. 30,000/- with Delhi High Court Bar Association Employees Welfare Fund within seven days.

11. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

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

AMIT SHARMA, J

MARCH 12, 2024/nk