



\$~8

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7207/2024**

DINESH & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Akshansh, Ms. Pragati Keshari
and Mr. Ankush, Advocates.

versus

**THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) RANHOLA POLICE STATION &
ANR. & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State
along with SI Rajat Khaiwal P.S.
Ranhola.
Mr. Amit Kumar, Advocate for
complainant/R-2 with Respondent
no.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

21.11.2024

%

1. By way of present petition, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No. 0755/2022 registered under Sections 380/447/448/453/384/354/506/509/34 IPC at P.S. Ranhola, Delhi on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. As per the allegations in the FIR, petitioner No.1 broke into the house of the respondent No.2 with his belongings, refused to vacate her property and demanded money for the same. He also touched respondent No.2 inappropriately and extended threats.
3. Learned APP for the State, on instructions, submits that the petitioners are the only accused persons and respondent No.2 is the complainant/victim in the present case.



4. Learned counsel for the parties submits that the petitioners and respondent No. 2 are known to each other being residents of the same locality and the present FIR has been registered due to misunderstanding. He further submits that parties have amicably settled their disputes vide Memorandum of Settlement dated 27.08.2024, 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 petitioners.

5. Petitioners, who are present in Court, have been identified by their counsel as well as the I.O. SI Rajat Khaiwal, P.S. Ranhola. Petitioners have shown remorse for their conduct and undertakes not to repeat the same in future.

6. Respondent No. 2, who is present in Court, has been identified by her counsel and the I.O. She states that she has settled the disputes with the petitioners out of her own free will, volition and without any coercion. She further states that all the obligations under the settlement arrived at have already been worked out and 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 ParbatbhaiAahir and Others v. State of Gujarat and Another reported as (2017) 9 SCC 641, it has been held as under:-

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

xxx

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing in so far as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned;



16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute;

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and... ”

9. Similarly, in *State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan and Others* reported as **(2019) 5 SCC 403**, it has been held as under:-

“15. Considering the law on the point and the other decisions of this Court on the point, referred to hereinabove, it is observed and held as under:

15.1. That the power conferred Under Section 482 of the Code to quash the criminal proceedings for the non-compoundable offences Under Section 320 of the Code can be exercised having overwhelmingly and predominantly the civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes and when the parties have resolved the entire dispute amongst themselves;”

10. 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.

11. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

NOVEMBER 21, 2024/ssc