



\$~70

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3727/2024**

MS SUSHMA BISHT

..... Petitioner

Through: Ms. Varmika Bajaj, Advocate with
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for State
with SI Jagdeep Sandhu PS South
Rohini, Delhi.
Respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

20.05.2024

%

1. The present proceedings are instituted under Section 482 Cr.P.C. on behalf of the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No. 879/2015 registered under Sections 420/467/468/471/201/506/120B IPC at Police Station, South Rohini, Delhi on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. The allegations in the present FIR relate to fraud and forgery with respect to the title deeds of an immovable property.
3. Mr. Aashneet Singh, learned APP for the State, on instructions, submits that the petitioner is the only accused and respondent No.2 is the complainant/victim in the present case. He states that charge-sheet has been filed. It is further informed that accused no. 2 Anand Bisht has statedly expired in the year 2016.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present FIR has



been registered due to misunderstanding. He further submits that parties have amicably settled their disputes vide consent decree dated 24.02.2022 passed in CS DJ 7781/2016 before the Court of learned ADJ, North West, Rohini Courts, Delhi, a copy of which has been placed on record. In terms of the said settlement, complainant is now left with no claim or grievance against the petitioners.

5. Petitioner who is present in Court, have been identified by her counsel as well as the I.O./ SI Jagdeep Sandhu PS South Rohini, Delhi. Respondent No.2 is also present in person and is identified by the IO.

6. Petitioner has shown remorse for her conduct and undertakes not to repeat the same in future. Respondent No. 2 also states that he has settled the disputes with the petitioner out of his own free will, volition and without any coercion. He further states that he has no objection if the present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed.

7. The parties shall remain bound by the statements made in Court today.

8. In Parbatbhai Aahir and Others v. State of Gujarat and Another reported as **(2017) 9 SCC 641**, it has been held as under:-

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

xxx

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing in so far as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned;

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in



appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute;

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and...”

9. Similarly, in State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan and Others reported as **(2019) 5 SCC 403**, it has been held as under:-

“15. Considering the law on the point and the other decisions of this Court on the point, referred to hereinabove, it is observed and held as under:

15.1. That the power conferred Under Section 482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings for the non-compoundable offences Under Section 320 of the Code can be exercised having overwhelmingly and predominantly the civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes and when the parties have resolved the entire dispute amongst themselves;”

10. In view of the above facts and considering that no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the proceedings, it is directed that the aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

11. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

MAY 20, 2024/rd