



\$~3 & 37

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

(3) W.P.(CRL) 1126/2024

(37)+ W.P.(CRL) 1161/2024

PARMINDER SINGH & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Rishi Manchanda,
Ms.Anjali Sharma and
Mr.Dipansh Verma, Advs.
along with Petitioners in
person.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr.Amol Sinha, ASC (Crl.)
with Mr.Kshitiz Garg and
Mr.Ashvini Kumar, Advs. in
W.P.(CRL) 1126/2024
Mr.Sanjay Lao, SC (Crl.) with
Mr.Abhinav Kumar Arya and
Mr.Shivesh Kaushik, Advs. in
W.P.(CRL) 1161/2024
Mr.Avinash Trivedi and
Mr.Rhythem Nagpal, Advs. for
R-2 along with R-2 in person.
SI Monil Kumar

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER

16.04.2024

%

CRL.M.A. 11228/2024 (Exemption) in W.P.(CRL) 1161/2024

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.



W.P.(CRL) 1126/2024

W.P.(CRL) 1161/2024

2. These petitions have been filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short, 'Cr.P.C.') seeking quashing of FIR No. 0409/2016 registered at Police Station: Shahbad Dairy, Outer-District, Delhi under Sections 420/406/468/471/506/452/453/454/379/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short, 'IPC'); and FIR No. 405/2016 registered at Police Station: Shahbad Dairy, Outer-District, Delhi under Sections 420/406/468/471/506/452/453/454/379/34 of the IPC, respectively.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the dispute between the parties, that is, the petitioners and the respondent no.2, arose out of a landlord-tenant relationship. The same has been amicably settled. He also draws my attention to the order dated 02.04.2024 passed by a learned Judge of this Court in CM(M) 2219/2024, titled *Parminder Singh v. Veena Gupta*.

4. The petitioners, who appear in court in person, hand over the keys of the premises in question, that is, entire building ~~bearing~~, comprising of the ground floor, first floor, and the second floor of H.No.9, Pocket-4, Sector-25, Rohini, Delhi-110085 to the respondent no.2. They further submit that they have handed over the peaceful vacant possession of the said premises and removed their belongings from the same. The costs imposed by this court vide its order dated 09.04.2024 in W.P. (Crl.) 1126/2024 has also been handed over by the petitioners to the respondent no.2 today in court.



5. The respondent no.2, who appears in person and has been duly identified by the Investigating Officer (IO), affirms the settlement and submits that she has settled all the disputes with the petitioners of her own free will and without any coercion. She submits that she has no objection if the FIR(s) in question are quashed by this Court.

6. I have perused the contents of the FIR and also the settlement arrived at between the parties.

7. Keeping in view the fact that the disputes arose out of a landlord tenancy relationship between the parties and the same have been settled, and also the fact that the respondent no.2 does not wish to pursue her complaint any further, I find that no useful purpose shall be served in continuing with the proceedings of the present FIR(s) as the chances of its success will be rather minuscule and it would rather create further acrimony between the parties and will be an unnecessary burden on the State exchequer.

8. Guided by the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court in its judgments in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303; *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinbhai Karmur & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Ors.* (2017) 9 SCC 641; and, *State of Haryana & Ors. v. Bhajan Lal & Ors.*, 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335, this Court deems it appropriate, in the interest of justice, to exercise its inherent powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR(s) and all the proceedings emanating therefrom.

9. Accordingly, the petitions are allowed. FIR No.0409/2016 registered at Police Station: Shahbad Dairy, Outer-District, Delhi under Sections 420/406/468/471/506/452/453/454/379/34 of the IPC;



and FIR No.0405/2016 registered at Police Station: Shahbad Dairy, Outer-District, Delhi under Sections 420/406/468/471/506/452/453/454/379/34 of the IPC respectively, against the petitioners are hereby quashed.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

APRIL 16, 2024/ns/ss

Click here to check corrigendum, if any