



\$~57

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 01.05.2024

+ CRL. M.C. 3398/2024

MANISH KUMAR SINGH & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.Nadeem Qureshi, Advocate
alongwith petitioners in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

.... Respondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP for State with
SI Naveen, P.S. Palam Village.
Mr.Anil Gahlot, Advocate with
respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA

%

J U D G M E N T

ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA, J (ORAL)

CRL.M.A. 13060/2024

Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.

Application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 3398/2024

1. Petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr.P.C.') has been preferred on behalf of the petitioners for quashing of FIR No. 452/2013, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at P.S.: Palam Village and proceedings emanating therefrom.
2. Issue notice. Learned APP for the State and learned counsel for respondent No.2 alongwith respondent No.2 appear on advance notice and accept notice.



3. In brief, as per the case of the petitioners, marriage between petitioner No.1 and respondent No. 2 was solemnized according to Hindu rites and ceremonies on 29.05.2010. No child was born out of the wedlock. Due to temperamental differences, respondent No.2 and petitioner No.1 started living separately. On complaint of respondent No. 2 present FIR was registered on 17.12.2013.
4. The disputes are stated to have been amicably settled between the parties in terms of Settlement Deed dated 30.03.2024. The marriage between petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2 has been dissolved by decree of divorce.
5. Balance amount of Rs. 15,00,000/- has been paid to respondent No.2 today through DD No.256901 dated 18.04.2024 drawn on State Bank of India, Sakinaka Mumbai Branch in favour of respondent No.2, towards full and final settlement between the parties.
6. Learned APP for the State submits that in view of amicable settlement between the parties, the State has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed.
7. Petitioners (through VC), Power of Attorney holder of petitioner No.1 and respondent No. 2 in person have been identified by SI Naveen, P.S.: Palam Village. I have interacted with the parties and they confirm that the matter has been amicably settled between them without any threat, pressure or coercion. Respondent No. 2 also states that nothing remains to be further adjudicated upon between the parties and she has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed.
8. Parties intend to put quietus to the proceedings arising out of matrimonial disputes. The settlement shall promote harmony between the



parties and permit them to move further in life. The chances of conviction are bleak in view of amicable settlement between the parties.

9. Considering the facts and circumstances, since the matter has been amicably settled between the parties, no useful purpose shall be served by keeping the case pending. It would be nothing but an abuse of the process of Court. Consequently, FIR No. 452/2013, under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at P.S.: Palam Village and the proceedings emanating therefrom stand quashed.

Petition is accordingly disposed of. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

A copy of this judgment be forwarded to learned Trial Court for information.

ANOOP KUMAR MENDIRATTA, J.

MAY 01, 2024/v