



\$~105

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2517/2024 & CRL.M.A. 26450/2024**

ARUN GOEL & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Arvind Kumar Gupta,
Mr. C. Prakash, Mr. Ankit
Goel, Ms. Ginni Garg, Mr.
Abhishemath Gupta, Mr.
Ramakant and Mohit
Garg, Advs. (through VC)
with P-1 (through VC) &
P- 2, 5 & 6 in person

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC
for the State
Complainant in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

01.10.2024

1. The present petition is filed *inter alia* seeking quashing of FIR No. 527/2024 dated 18.08.2024, registered at Police Station North Rohini, for offences under Sections 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC').
2. The FIR was registered pursuant to order dated 12.08.2024, passed by the learned Additional Sessions Judge, North-West District, Rohini Courts, Delhi, in Cr Rev No.115/2024 whereby directions were issued to the concerned SHO to register an FIR under the relevant provisions on the complaint made by Respondent No.2.
3. It is alleged that Petitioner Nos. 3 and 4, who are property

W.P.(CRL) 2517/2024

Page 1 of 3



dealers, had introduced Petitioner No.1 and Petitioner No.2 (father of Petitioner No.1) to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, who are married to each other. It is alleged that Petitioner No.1 was falsely represented to be the absolute owner of the property in question, that is, property bearing No. B-4/126, 1st Floor, Paschim Vihar, Delhi-63 (hereafter '**subject property**'). It is alleged that Petitioner No.1 had entered into an Agreement to Sell in relation to the subject property and Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 were induced to purchase the same and were cheated of a sum of ₹61,51,000/- , out of the total sale amount of ₹1,61,51,000/-.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the subject property was jointly owned by the petitioners and other persons and the said fact was known to Respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

5. He submits that the parties have since amicably resolved their dispute, on their own free will, without any force, fraud or pressure.

6. The learned counsel for Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 states that Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are satisfied with the settlement amount and they do not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the present FIR.

7. Petitioner No.1 is present through video conference. Petitioner Nos. 2, 5 and 6 and Respondent No.2 are present in person. The parties have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

8. The learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State submits that the offence is compoundable in nature and has no objection if the FIR is quashed. Respondent No. 2, on being asked, reaffirms the submission made by State.



9. Offence under Section 20 of the IPC is compoundable in nature.

10. This Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by relegating the parties to the learned Trial Court for filing an application to compound the offence.

11. 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.

12. In view of the above, FIR No. 527/2024 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed on the ground of settlement.

13. The present petition is allowed in aforesaid terms. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 1, 2024

“SS”