



\$~11

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 412/2024 & CRL.M.A. 1604/2024**
BABLU

..... Petitioner
Through: Mr.Sandeep Mishra,
Ms.Nandika Vyas & Mr.Dhruv
Gandotra, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

..... Respondents
Through: Mr.Shoaib Haider, APP.
SI Jeniffer Lalnunthieng, PS
R.K. Puram.
Respondent no.2 present
through VC.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE NAVIN CHAWLA

ORDER
26.02.2024

%

1. This petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (in short, 'Cr.P.C.') seeking quashing of Criminal Case being Cr.Case No. 4666/2017 titled ***State v. Babloo & Ors.*** pending adjudication before the learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court-02, New Delhi District, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi (hereinafter referred to as the 'Trial Court'), arising out of the FIR No. 445/2016 registered at Police Station: R.K. Puram, South District, Delhi, under Sections 354/451/506/509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (in short, 'IPC'), along with all other proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a settlement.
2. Issue Notice.



3. Notice is accepted by Mr. Shoaib Haider, learned APP for the State.
4. The petitioners and the respondent no.2 are neighbours and the disputes arose out of some petty issues between the parties, which led to the filing of the above FIR.
5. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties have amicably settled their *inter se* disputes and the respondent no.2 has given her statement to this effect before the learned Trial Court. He submits that the learned Trial Court vide Order dated 25.08.2023, on the basis of the settlement arrived at between the parties and upon its satisfaction, has allowed compounding of the offence against, and has acquitted, the co-accused person, namely, Satender.
6. The respondent no.2 is present in the Court (through VC) and has been duly identified by the Investigating Officer (IO). She reaffirms the abovementioned settlement and states that she has settled all the disputes with the petitioner out of her own free will and without any coercion. The respondent no.2 submits that she has no objection if the present FIR is quashed.
7. I have perused the contents of the FIR and considered the submissions made on behalf of the parties.
8. Keeping in view the fact that the parties are neighbours and that the respondent no.2 does not wish to pursue her complaint any further, as also the Settlement arrived at between the parties, I find that no useful purpose shall be served in continuing with the proceedings of the present FIR as the chances of its success will be rather minuscule and it would create further acrimony between the parties and will be



an unnecessary burden on the State exchequer.

9. Guided by the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court in its judgments in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303; *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinbhai Karmur & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Ors.* (2017) 9 SCC 641 and *State of Haryana & Ors. v. Bhajan Lal & Ors.* 1992 Supp (1) SCC 335, this Court deems it appropriate, in the interest of justice, to exercise its inherent powers under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. to quash the FIR and all the proceedings emanating therefrom.

10. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. FIR No. 445/2016 registered at Police Station: R.K. Puram, South District, Delhi, under Sections 354/451/506/509 of IPC and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioner are quashed, subject to the condition that the petitioner shall deposit costs of Rs.20,000/- with the Delhi High Court Bar Clerk's Association within a period of two weeks from today, and file proof of such deposit with the Registry of this Court and also supply a copy thereof to the IO, within the said period.

11. The pending application is also disposed of as infructuous.

NAVIN CHAWLA, J

FEBRUARY 26, 2024/rv/AS

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)