



\$~1

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3604/2024**

DEEPAK ARORA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sachin Bansal, Mr. Surender
Nandal, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for
the State with Insp. Pawan, S.I. Ritu,
P.S. North Rohini.
Mr. Nalin Kaushik, Mr. Lakshay
Kumar, Advocates for R-2 & 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

24.05.2024

%

1. The present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of FIR No. 222/2016, under Sections 323/354/354A(1)/354B/509 of the IPC, registered at P.S. North Rohini and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Renu, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court, Rohini, Delhi.
2. Amended memo of parties arraying Sunny @ Devi Datt as respondent no. 3 has been filed and the same is taken on record.
3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that the present FIR was registered on account of a parking dispute. It is submitted that as a result of the said dispute, a cross-FIR, i.e., FIR No. 223/2016, under Sections 323/354/354A(1)/509/506/34 of the IPC, was registered at P.S. North Rohini, on behalf of the mother of the petitioner



herein, against respondents Nos. 2 and 3.

4. It is further submitted that during the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, parties have entered into a compromise/settlement deed dated 28.03.2024, pursuant to which parties have no objection to quashing of the cross FIRs. The cross FIR, i.e, FIR No. 223/2016, under Sections 323/354/354A(1)/509/506/34 of the IPC registered at PS North Rohini is the subject matter of CRL.M.C. 3615/2024 which is being disposed of by a separate order of same date. It is pointed out that affidavits of respondent no. 2 and 3 have also been placed on record whereby they have given no objection to the quashing of the present FIR and have stated that they have entered into settlement with the petitioner out of their free will and without any coercion, undue influence or threat from any person.

5. Petitioner and respondent no. 2/complainant and respondent no. 3 are present before the Court and have been duly identified by their respective counsel, as well as the Investigating Officer, SI Ritu, PS North Rohini.

6. Respondent no. 2/complainant and respondent no. 3 states that the matter has been settled with the petitioner and they have no objection if the FIR is quashed.

7. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned APP for the State also has no objection if the present FIR is quashed subject to imposition of cost.

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. 222/2016, under Sections 323/354/354A(1)/354B/509 of the IPC, registered at P.S. North Rohini and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Renu, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court, Rohini, Delhi.

10. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 222/2016, under Sections 323/354/354A(1)/354B/509 of the IPC, registered at P.S. North Rohini and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Renu, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court, Rohini, Delhi, is hereby quashed, subject to payment of cost of Rs. 25,000/- to be deposited by petitioner with the New Delhi Bar Association Members Welfare Fund Account No. 18580110013847 within a period of seven working days from today.

11. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

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

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 24, 2024/ab

Click here to check corrigendum, if any