



\$~77

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3314/2024 & CRL.M.A. 12770/2024 Exemption

SHADI LAL BHATLA AND ORS Petitioners

Through: Mr. Anoop Verma, Adv. with
petitioners in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for
the State with SI Durgesh, P.S. Dabri.
Respondent no.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

29.04.2024

%

1. The present petition under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of the FIR No. 643/2016, under Sections 452/506/323/354/342/509/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Dabri and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Vaishali Singh, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, District South West, Dwarka, Delhi.
2. It has been submitted that connected petitions between the same parties being CRL.M.C. 3275/2024 and CRL.M.C. 3296/2024 has been quashed by a Coordinate Bench of this Court *vide* orders of even date.
3. On 24.11.2021, parties arrived at a settlement at Mediation Centre, Dwarka and as per the said settlement deed, husband of respondent no.2 i.e., Deepak Bhatia, who is the son of petitioner no. 1 herein, has agreed to pay an amount of Rs. 27,00,000/- to the respondent no.2. The copy of the



aforesaid settlement deed dated 24.11.2021 is on record (Annexure A-3).

4. 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, SI Durgesh, P.S. Dabri.

5. A demand draft bearing no. 737738 dated 11.03.2024 for Rs. 1,50,000/- drawn on IDFC First Bank has been handed over to complainant/Respondent No.2, who acknowledges the receipt of the same.

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.

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. 643/2016, under Sections 452/506/323/354/342/509/34 IPC, registered at P.S. Dabri and all other



consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Vaishali Singh, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, District South West, Dwarka, Delhi.

10. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 643/2016, under Sections 452/506/323/354/342/509/34 IPC, registered at P.S. Dabri and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Vaishali Singh, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, District South West, Dwarka, Delhi, is hereby quashed.

11. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

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

AMIT SHARMA, J

APRIL 29, 2024/nk

Click here to check corrigendum, if any