



\$~52 & 53

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2334/2024**

MITHUN MITTAL

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Manish Makkar, Ms. L. Virmani
and Ms. Bharti Saran, Advocates.**

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: **Mr. Rahul Tyagi, Ld. ASC with Mr.
Dhiraj Basoya, Mr. Rohtas Basoya,
Mr. Deepanshu, Mr. Jhantab Hussain,
Mr. Ankush Kishore, Mr. Satyam
Maurya and Mr. Abhishek Tomar,
Advocates with Insp. Pawan Kumar
P.S. Kanjhawala.**

53

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2340/2024**

MANJU MITTAL

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Manish Makkar, Ms. L. Virmani
and Ms. Bharti Saran, Advocates.**

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: **Mr. Rahul Tyagi, Ld. ASC with Mr.
Dhiraj Basoya, Mr. Rohtas Basoya,
Mr. Deepanshu, Mr. Jhantab Hussain,
Mr. Ankush Kishore, Mr. Satyam
Maurya and Mr. Abhishek Tomar,**



Advocates with Insp. Pawan Kumar
P.S. Kanjhawala.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

%

05.08.2024

CRL.M.A. 22829/2024 In W.P.(CRL) 2334/2024 (Seeking Exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. The application is accordingly disposed.

CRL.M.A. 22875/2024 In W.P.(CRL) 2340/2024 (Seeking Exemption)

3. Allowed, subject to just exceptions.
4. The application is accordingly disposed.

W.P.(CRL) 2334/2024 & W.P.(CRL) 2340/2024

5. The above two petitions under Article 226 of Constitution of India read with Section 528 of BNSS have been filed on behalf of the petitioners seeking quashing of FIR No.547/2022 P.S. Kanjhawala dated 31.08.2022 registered under Section 419/420/467/471/120B IPC and the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom.

6. It is submitted in the petitions that the dispute inter-se was in respect of the property bearing Khasra No.72/3/2-4-5 measuring 8 bigha situated at Village Karala, Delhi. There were three Civil Suits pending before the District Courts, which all have been now settled amicably and have been disposed of. It is further submitted that Statement on Oath dated 05.07.2024 has been made by the complainant through her SPA endorsing that the entire disputes stands settled and the complainant shall be cooperating in the quashing of FIR.

7. The petitioners and the SPAs are present in person, who have



endorsed the Settlement inter-se the parties. The complainants have No Objection to the quashing of FIR. However, it is pointed that there are two more petitioners namely Roshni Devi and Kamal Kant with whom the complainant has not been able to enter into a Settlement.

8. **Submissions heard.**

9. From the very nature of the transactions which is the sale of the suit property from one person to the other person, there cannot be any piecemeal settlement with some accused to the exclusion of the others. Therefore, the petitions are hereby dismissed with liberty to the parties to move a comprehensive petition for quashing in case there is a settlement with all the accused persons.

10. The petitions are accordingly disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

AUGUST 5, 2024/va