



\$~67

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ CRL.M.C. 3657/2024 & CRL.M.A. 13999/2024 (Stay),
CRL.M.A. 14000/2024 (Exemption)

RAM SINGH ALIAS RAMU & ANR.

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rajeev Sirohi and Mr. Puneet
Narula, Advocates alongwith
petitioners in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for the
State.

SI Sachin Panwar, PS Fatehpur Beri.
Ms. Kirti Aggarwal, Advocate for R-2
R-2 through VC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

07.05.2024

%

1. The present petition Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of the FIR No. 441/2018, under Sections 323/324/341/506/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Fatehpur Beri and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Sh. Ashish Kumar Meena, Learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Saket Courts, Delhi.
2. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners submits that during the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, parties have settled their disputes before the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi, *vide* settlement deed dated 06.10.2023 (Annexure P-5) and in pursuance of the same, respondent no. 2 has no objection if the present FIR is quashed against



the petitioners.

3. Petitioners are present before the Court and complainant/respondent no. 2 appears through video conferencing and they have been duly identified by their respective counsels, as well as the Investigating Officer, SI Sachin Panwar, PS Fatehpur Beri.

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. 441/2018, under Sections 323/324/341/506/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Fatehpur Beri and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Sh. Ashish Kumar Meena, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Saket Courts, Delhi.

8. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No.



441/2018, under Sections 323/324/341/506/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Fatehpur Beri and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Sh. Ashish Kumar Meena, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Saket Courts, Delhi, is hereby quashed, subject to a cost of Rs. 10,000/- each to be paid by the petitioners, as a consolidated amount of Rs. 20,000/- with the Saket Bar Association Welfare Fund (A/c No. 32895685000, State Bank of India) within a period of one week from today.

9. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

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

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 07, 2024/sn

Click here to check corrigendum, if any