



\$~52

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 6087/2023**

PRAVEEN KUMAR, AND ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr.M.K. Mishra, Advocate with
petitioners in person

versus

THE STATE, AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for State with
SI Dhirender Kumar
Respondent No.2 and *Sanat Chaudhary* in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER
27.02.2024

%

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.61/2022 registered under Sections 419/420/468/471/120B IPC at P.S. Cyber Police (Central), Delhi on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. The allegations in the present FIR relate to cheating and forgery in respect of VFS appointment committed by the petitioners.
3. Learned APP for the State submits that the petitioners are the only accused persons and respondent No.2 and *Sanat Chaudhary* are the complainants/victims.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in terms of the last order, an amended memo of parties has been filed whereby, *Sanat*



Chaudhary has been impleaded as a respondent. He further submits that petitioner No.1 could not come on account of attending to his ailing father.

5. It is further submitted that the parties have entered into a settlement vide Memorandum of Understanding dated 24.02.2023. In terms of the settlement, respondent No.2 is now left with no claim whatsoever against the present petitioners. Sanat Chaudhary, who is present in Court, states that he has also settled the matter with the petitioners.

6. Petitioner Nos.2 to 4, who are present in the Court, have been identified by their counsel as well as by the Investigating Officer. Respondent No.2 and *Sanat Chaudhary*, who are present in the Court, have also been identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. Respondent No.2 state that he has entered into the aforesaid Memorandum of Understanding out of their own free will, volition and without any coercion. He states that he has no objection if the present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed. Sanat Chaudhary also states that he has no objection to the quashing of the present FIR.

8. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that no other proceedings are pending between the parties.

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

10. 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...”

11. 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;”

12. In view of the above facts and since no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the present criminal proceedings, it is directed that the aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed, subject to payment of cost of Rs.10,000/- by each of the petitioners



to be deposited with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority within a period of four weeks from today. The amount so deposited shall be utilized by the Delhi State Legal Services Authority for providing counselling/psychological support to POCSO victims requiring such assistance.

13. Proof evidencing receipt of deposit shall be filed with the Investigating Officer as well as in Court.

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

15. Let a copy of this order be communicated to the Member Secretary, Delhi State Legal Services Authority for information.

16. The Registry shall list the matter before this Court in case receipt of costs to be paid by the petitioners is not filed within the stipulated time period.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

FEBRUARY 27, 2024

na