



\$~68

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 6087/2024 & CRL. M.A.23317/2024**

RAM KISHORE ALIAS RAME

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. R.K. Gupta, Advocate with
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with SI Akash Kumar PS Bhajanpura,
Delhi.

Respondent no.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

07.08.2024

%

1. The present proceedings are instituted on behalf of the petitioner who is seeking quashing of FIR No. 614/2013 registered under Sections 354/354A/354D/506/34 IPC at Police Station Bhajanpura, Delhi, on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner, who is a neighbour of the complainant, harassed the complainant on multiple occasions by making vulgar comments, causing mental distress.
3. Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, learned APP for the State, confirms that respondent No. 2 is the complainant/victim in the present case. He, on instructions, submits that though there is another co-accused, namely, Tannu, chargesheet is filed only against the present petitioner and that the co-accused Tannu was not traceable during investigation.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present FIR was registered due to misunderstanding and that with the intervention of family members and friends, parties have amicably settled their disputes vide Compromise Deed dated 15.12.2022, a copy of which has been placed on record. In terms of the said settlement, complainant is now left with no claim or grievance against the petitioner.

5. The petitioner, who is present in the Court, has been identified by his counsel as well as the I.O./ SI Akash Kumar PS Bhajanpura, Delhi. Respondent No. 2 is also present in Court and has been identified by the I.O.

6. The petitioner has shown remorse for his conduct and undertakes not to repeat the same in future. Respondent No. 2 also states that she has entered into the aforementioned compromise deed 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. The parties shall remain bound by the statements made in Court today.

8. In view of the above facts and considering that no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the proceedings, it is directed that the aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed qua the present petitioner only, subject to payment of cost of Rs.10,000/- to be paid to the respondent no.2 by demand draft through I.O. within two weeks and the proof evidencing receipt of payment shall be filed with the I.O. The State, however, shall be at liberty to prosecute the other accused, namely Tannu, in accordance with law, as and when arrested.

9. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of alongwith miscellaneous application.



10. In case the proof of payment of cost is not filed within two weeks, the I.O. shall be at liberty to move an appropriate application in this regard.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

AUGUST 7, 2024/*rd*