



\$~60

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3461/2024 & CRL.M.A. 13306/2024 Exemption,
CRL.M.A. 13307/2024 Delay in re-filing 30 days

VIKAS KHATTAR

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arun Kumar, Adv. with
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for
State with SI Sunil Nath, P.S. Rani
Bagh.
Mr. Sumit Gaba, Adv. for R-2 with
R-2/complainant in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER
02.05.2024

%

1. The present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of FIR No. 129/2019, under Sections 354D/509 of the IPC, registered at PS Rani Bagh, New Delhi and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet filed and pending before the Court of Ms. Preeti Rajoria, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, North-West, Delhi.
2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on account of monetary dispute several FIRs have been registered. It is submitted that *vide* an MOU dated 07.07.2023 the parties had resolved their dispute and in pursuance of which the said FIRs against each other were sought to be quashed. It is pointed out that FIR No. 519/2015 under Section 420/406/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Rani Bagh and FIR No. 401/2015 under



Sections 365/342/368/386/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Rani Bagh, subject matter of CRL.M.C. 3265/2024 and CRL.M.C. 3355/2024 respectively and have been disposed of by a coordinate bench of this Court *vide* order dated 01.05.2024. The other FIR bearing no. 662/2015 under Section 420/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Rani Bagh, subject matter of CRL.M.C. 3504/2024, has been disposed of by a separate order of even date.

3. Petitioner 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, with SI Sunil Nath, P.S. Rani Bagh.

4. 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.

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, 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.”

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. 129/2019, under Section 354D/509 of the IPC, registered at PS Rani Bagh, New Delhi and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet filed and pending before the Court of Ms. Preeti Rajoria, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, North-West, Delhi.

8. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 129/2019, under Section 354D/509 of the IPC, registered at PS Rani Bagh, New Delhi and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet filed and pending before the Court of Ms. Preeti Rajoria, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, North-West, 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

MAY 2, 2024/nk

Click here to check corrigendum, if any