



\$~94

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

W.P.(CRL) 1729/2024

PUSPLATA@PUSHPA LATA VERMA & ORS.

..... Petitioners

Through: Adv. Rakhi Dubey, Adv. Sandeep Kumar Dubey, Adv. Saudeep Singh, Adv. Saksham Verma, Adv. A.K. Mishra, Adv. Vinod Kumar, Adv. Ashish Bhardwaj & Adv. Mahima Katara along with all the petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR..... Respondents

Through: Ms. Rupali Bandopadhyaya, ASC for the State with Sagar Mehlawat & Mr. Abhijeet Singh, Advs. SI Neeraj Chahal, PS Seelampur. Mr. Sudhakar Singh, Mr. Aman, Mr. Vinay Kumar & Mr. Nitin Kumar Gaur, Adv. for R-2 along with R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

28.05.2024

%

CRL.M.A. 16871/2024

1. Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 1729/2024

3. The present petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') seeking quashing of FIR No.

W.P.(CRL) 1729/2024

Page 1 of 3



0026/2024 dated 09.01.2024 registered at Police Station Seelampur, for offences under Sections 325/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'), including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. The said FIR was registered on a complaint filed by Respondent No. 2.

4. It is averred that due to some misunderstanding, an altercation took place between Respondent No.2 and the petitioners. It is stated that the petitioners and Respondent No. 2 are family members. There was a property dispute and the Respondent No. 2 is the daughter-in-law and she wanted her husband to get a fair share.

5. It is submitted that the parties have since settled their disputes with the intervention of other relatives and friends, by way of Compromise Deed dated 22.05.2024, on their own free will, without any pressure, coercion or undue influence.

6. Petitioner Nos. 1 to 4 and Respondent No. 2 are present in person in Court. The parties have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. Respondent No.2, on being asked, states that she does not wish to pursue any proceedings arising out of the present FIR and has no objection as the same is quashed.

8. She submits that the FIR was registered pursuant to miscommunication and misunderstanding and the parties have since resolved their disputes.

9. Offences under Sections 325/506 of the IPC are compoundable.

10. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the dispute alive and continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the



process of Court. I am of the opinion that this is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 482 of the CrPC.

11. In view of the above, FIR No. 0026/2024 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed.

12. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MAY 28, 2024

“SK”