



\$~62

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3628/2024 CRL.M.A. 13906/2024 Exemption

SANDEEP SOLANKI@ SONU & ORS. Petitioners

Through: Mr. Shailender Dahiya, Mr. Aman
Raj Singh, Advs. with petitioners in
person.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for the
State
SI Braham Parkash, P.S. Sultan Puri.
Mr. Sanjay Suri, Mr. Rishabh Relan,
Ms. Vinny & Mr. Abhishek Singh,
Advs. for R-2 with R-2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER
07.05.2024

%

1. The present petition filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of FIR No. 162/2010, under Sections 448/454/380/506/201/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Sultan Puri and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Sanya Dalal, Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Rohini Courts, Delhi.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the present FIR was registered on account of dispute relating to trespassing in property and subsequent removal of belongings between the petitioners and respondent no.2. It is submitted that during the course of the aforesaid



proceedings, the parties have arrived at Memorandum of Settlement dated 18.03.2024 (Annexure P-2) in pursuance of which the parties have settled their dispute and respondent no.2 has no objection to the quashing of the FIR and the proceedings emanating therefrom.

3. Petitioners 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, SI Braham Parkash, P.S. Sultan Puri.

4. The complainant/respondent No.2 states that the matter has been settled with the petitioners and he has no objection if the FIR is quashed.

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. 162/2010, under Sections 448/454/380/506/201/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Sultan Puri and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Sanya Dalal, Learned



Metropolitan Magistrate, Rohini Courts, Delhi.

8. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 162/2010, under Sections 448/454/380/506/201/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Sultan Puri and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Sanya Dalal, Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Rohini Courts, Delhi, is hereby quashed, subject to petitioners depositing a consolidated cost of Rs. 50,000/- with New Delhi Bar Association Members Welfare Fund (account No. 18580110013847) within 7 days.
9. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.
10. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 7, 2024/nk

Click here to check corrigendum, if any