



\$~87

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3155/2024 & CRL.M.As. 12209-10/2024**

SURINDER SINGH TANEJA Petitioner

Through: Mr. Gurmukh Singh Arora and Mr.
Vansh Bajaj, Advocates with
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS. Respondents

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for State
with WSI Sangeeta PS Mukherjee
Nagar, Delhi.

Mr. Manoj Singh, Advocate for
respondent No.2 with respondent
No.2 through VC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

25.04.2024

%

1. The present proceedings are instituted under Section 482 Cr.P.C. on behalf of the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No. 818/2014 registered under Sections 420/467/406/471 IPC at Police Station Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. The allegations in the present FIR relate to fraud and forgery and fabrication of documents with respect to an immovable property.
3. Mr. Aashneet Singh, learned APP for the State, on instructions, submits that the petitioner is the only accused and respondent No.2 is the complainant/victim in the present case.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present FIR has been registered due to misunderstanding. He further submits that parties have amicably settled their disputes vide Memorandum of Understanding



dated 07.03.2024, a copy of which has been placed on record. In terms of the said settlement, complainant is now left with no claim or grievance against the petitioner.

5. Petitioner and respondent No.2, who are present in Court, have been identified by their respective counsel as well as the I.O/ WSI Sangeeta PS Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi.

6. Petitioner has shown remorse for his conduct and undertakes not to repeat the same in future. Respondent No. 2 who has joined the proceedings through VC also states that he has settled the disputes with the petitioner out of his own free will, volition and without any coercion. He further states that she has no objection if the present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed.

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

8. In ParbatbhaiAahir 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... ”

9. 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;”

10. In view of the above facts and considering that no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the proceedings, it is directed that the aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

11. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of alongwith miscellaneous applications.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

APRIL 25, 2024/rd