



\$~77

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 6617/2024
REKHA BANSALPetitioner
Through: Mr. Vikram Saini & Ms.
Pooja Saini, Advocates
alongwith Petitioner-in-
Person.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh,
APP for the State.
Mr. Anil Gujral, Advocate
with R-2/Dr. Sat Prakash
Gupta-in-Person.
SI Sajid Hussain (P.S.
Malviya Nagar).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
21.10.2024

%

CRL.M.C. 6617/2024

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 82/2018 dated 27.03.2018, registered at Police Station Malviya Nagar, for offences under Sections 406/420/120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'). The chargesheet has been filed in the present case.
2. It is alleged that the petitioner along with other accused persons committed breach of trust and cheated Respondent No. 2 and his wife of their money to the tune of ₹68,50,000/-, by fraudulently inducing them to invest in some import-export business.
3. The present petition is filed on the ground that the parties have settled all their disputes by way of Memorandum of

CRL.M.C. 6617/2024

Page 1 of 2



Understanding ('MoU') dated 17.08.2024, on their own free will, without any force, coercion, or undue influence.

4. As per the MOU, the petitioner shall pay a total sum of ₹30,00,000/- to Respondent No. 2 as full and final settlement of all the claims of Respondent No. 2 against the petitioner.

5. The parties are present in person before this Court today and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

6. On being asked, Respondent No.2/complainant states that he has received the settlement amount of ₹30,00,000/- by way of Demand Draft in favour of his wife, and that he does not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the present FIR against the petitioner.

7. Offences under Sections 420/406 of the IPC are compoundable in nature.

8. Keeping in view the nature of the 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 528 of the BNSS.

9. In view of the above, FIR No. 82/2018 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed and the petitioner is discharged from the present FIR.

10. The present petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 21, 2024

'Aman'