



\$~74

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3369/2024**

DHARMENDER SHARMA & ORS. Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sumit Solanki and Mr.
P.K.Pandey, Advocates.
Petitioners through VC.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for
the State.
SI Sunil, PS Najafgarh.
R-2 through VC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

30.04.2024

%

1. The present writ petition under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of FIR No. 656/2020, under Sections 345(C)/323/34 of the IPC and Section 67 of the IT Act, registered at P.S. Najafgarh and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Divya Yadav, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court, Dwarka Courts, Delhi.

2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that respondent no. 2 is wife of petitioner no. 1 and petitioner nos. 2 and 3 are brother-in-law and sister-in-law of respondent no.2 respectively. It is further submitted that during the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, parties have arrived at a settlement *vide* Memorandum of Understanding dated 22.04.2024 in pursuance of which respondent no. 2 has no objection if the



present FIR alongwith the consequential proceedings are quashed.

3. Petitioners and complainant/respondent no. 2 are present before the Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer, SI Sunil, PS Najafgarh.

4. The Complainant/respondent No.2 states that the matter has been settled and she is living with petitioner no. 1 at their matrimonial home and she has no objection if the FIR is quashed against the petitioners.

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

6. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab* (2012) 10 SCC 303, 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 proceedings.”

7. 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. 656/2020, under Sections 345(C)/323/34 of the IPC and Section 67 of the IT Act, registered at P.S. Najafgarh and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Divya Yadav, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court, Dwarka Courts, Delhi.



8. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 656/2020, under Sections 345(C)/323/34 of the IPC and Section 67 of the IT Act, registered at P.S. Najafgarh and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Divya Yadav, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court, Dwarka Courts, Delhi, is hereby quashed.

9. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

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

AMIT SHARMA, J

APRIL 30, 2024/sn

Click here to check corrigendum, if any