



\$~7

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CRL.M.C. 3599/2024

RAMAN PANDEY AND ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Ms.Parul Verma and Mr.Anuj
Kumar Garg, Advs.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP with
ASI Kanwal Kaur
Mr.Amit Gupta, Mr.Manoj
Kumar Thakur and Mr.Tarun
Gupta, Advs. for R-2 along
with R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER

%

31.05.2024

CRL.M.A. 17723/2024

1. This application seeks early hearing of the present petition. The same is allowed and the matter is taken up for hearing today itself.

CRL.M.C. 3599/2024 & CRL.M.A. 13818/2024

2. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short, 'Cr.P.C.') seeking quashing of FIR No.0642/2023 registered at Police Station: Jagat Puri, Delhi under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short, 'IPC'), along with all other proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a settlement.

3. Issue notice.



4. Notice is accepted by Mr. Shoaib Haider, learned APP for the respondent no.1 and by Mr.Amit Gupta, Advocate for the respondent no.2.
5. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the subject FIR was an offshoot of the matrimonial discord between the parties, that is, the petitioner no.1 and the respondent no.2.
6. He submits that the parties have amicably settled their *inter se* disputes before Counselling Cell, Family Court, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi vide Settlement dated 04.01.2024.
7. Pursuant to the abovementioned settlement, the parties have obtained divorce by mutual consent vide Decree of Divorce dated 13.05.2024 passed by the learned Judge, Family Court, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
8. The respondent no.2, who appears in Court in person and has been duly identified by the Investigating Officer (IO), reaffirms the above-mentioned settlement and states that she has settled all the disputes with the petitioners out of her own free will and without any coercion. She submits that she has no objection if the present FIR is quashed.
9. The respondent no.2 submits that she has received all amounts in terms of the settlement.
10. I have perused the contents of the FIR and also the Settlement between the parties.
11. Keeping in view the fact that the disputes between the parties arose out of a matrimonial relationship, and now the same have been amicably settled, and a decree of divorce has also been passed by the



learned family court pursuant to the settlement and also looking into the nature of the allegations made in the complaint, in my opinion, no useful purpose would be served in keeping the FIR alive. In fact, it would rather create further acrimony between the parties and will be an unnecessary burden on the State Exchequer.

12. Guided by the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court in its judgments in *Jitendra Raghuvanshi v. Babita Raghuvanshi*, (2013) 4 SCC 58, *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303; *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinbhai Karmur & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Ors.* (2017) 9 SCC 641; and, *State of Haryana & Ors. v. Bhajan Lal & Ors.* 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335, this Court deems it appropriate, in the interest of justice, to exercise its inherent powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR and all the proceedings emanating therefrom.

13. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. FIR No.0642/2023 registered at Police Station: Jagat Puri, Delhi under Sections 406/498A/34 of the IPC, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioners are quashed. The pending application also stands disposed of as infructuous.

14. The next date of hearing, i.e, 15.07.2024 shall stand cancelled.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

MAY 31, 2024/ns/am

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)