



\$~53

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7374/2023 and CRL.M.A. 27475/2023**

TARUNA SHARMA

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr.Pradeep Kr. Shukla, Advocate with
petitioner in person

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI

..... Respondent

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with SI Kunal Kumar
Mr.Faiyaz Khalid, Advocate for respondent No.2
with respondent No.2 through V.C.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER
22.02.2024

%

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No. 254/2020 registered under Sections 420 IPC at P.S. Sector 23 Dwarka,, Delhi on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. The allegations in the present FIR relate to fraud under the false pretext of employment.
3. Learned APP for the State submits that in the present case, the petitioner is the only accused and respondent No.2 is the only complainant/victim.
4. Learned counsels for the parties submit that the parties have entered into a settlement vide Settlement Agreement/Compromise dated 30.06.2023.



In terms of the settlement, respondent No. 2 is now left with no claim whatsoever against the petitioner.

5. The petitioner, who is present in the Court and respondent No.2, who has joined the proceedings through V.C., have been identified by their respective counsels and the Investigating Officer.

6. Respondent No.2 states that she has entered into the aforesaid Settlement Agreement/Compromise out of her own free will, volition and without any coercion. She further states that she has no objection if the present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed.

7. Learned counsels for the parties submit that no other proceedings are pending between the parties.

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

9. 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...”

10. 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;”

11. 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 costs of Rs.5,000/- by the petitioner to be deposited with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority within a period of two 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.

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

13. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of alongwith the pending application.



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

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

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

FEBRUARY 22, 2024

na