



\$~2

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

+ CRL.M.C. 695/2024

VIKAS

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Karamveer Singh & Mr. Naveen
Kumar, Advs. with petitioner in
person.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI AND ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for
the State with SI Dharm Singh, P.S.
Hauz Khas.
Ms. Vandana, Adv. for R-2 & 3 with
R-2 & 3 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

15.03.2024

%

1. The present petition filed under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C read with Article 227 of the Constitution of India seeks quashing of the FIR No. 1027/2014, under Sections 354/354A/323/341/509 IPC, registered at P.S. Hauz Khas and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Rashi Raheja, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Saket Court.
2. Amended memo of parties has been filed and the same is taken on record.
3. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have settled their dispute *vide* MOU dated 12.12.2023. The copy of the aforesaid MOU dated 12.12.2023 is on record (Annexure P-7).
4. Petitioner and complainant/respondent no. 2 and respondent no.3 are



present before the Court and have been duly identified by their respective counsel, as well as the Investigating Officer, SI Dharm Singh, P.S. Hauz Khas.

5. The complainant/respondent No.2 and respondent no.3 states that the matter has been settled with the petitioner and they have no objection if the FIR is quashed.

6. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned APP for the State also has no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

7. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

“61. ... In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

8. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and the fact that the parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 1027/2014, under Sections 354/354A/323/341/509 IPC, registered at P.S. Hauz Khas and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Rashi Raheja, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Saket Court.

9. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 1027/2014, under Sections 354/354A/323/341/509 IPC, registered at P.S.



Hauz Khas and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the court of Ms. Rashi Raheja, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Saket Court, is hereby quashed.

10. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.
11. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MARCH 15, 2024/nk