



\$~83, 86, 87

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 3303/2024, CRL.M.A. 31849/2024

SANDEEP & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Deepak Yadav, Mr. Vikrant,
Advts.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for
State with W/SI Sangeeta, PS S.B.
Dair

+ W.P.(CRL) 3281/2024, CRL.M.A. 31651/2024

RAVI SHUKLA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through:

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for
State with W/SI Sangeeta, PS S.B.
Dairy
Mr. Deepak Yadav, Mr. Vikrant,
Advts. for R-2

+ W.P.(CRL) 3282/2024, CRL.M.A.31652/2024

SANDEEP & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through:

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for
State with W/SI Sangeeta, PS S.B.
Dairy
Mr. Deepak Yadav, Mr. Vikrant,
Advts. for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SHARMA

ORDER

22.10.2024

%

1. The present petitions have been filed seeking quashing of FIRs. It has



been submitted that four cross FIR has been registered between the parties details of which are as mentioned hereinunder:

S. NO.	COMPLAINANT	FIR NO.	SECTION	POLICE STATION	ACCUSED PERSON
1.	Ravi Kr Shukla	553/22	323/341/354B/ 427/506/34 IPC	Shahbad Dairy	Sandeep Neelam Yogesh Prabhat Joginder
2.	(deceased)	554/22	323/341/354A/45 1/34 IPC	Shahbad Dairy	Sandeep Suman Neelam
3.	Neelam	590/22	323/341/354B/50 6/34 IPC	Shahbad Dairy	Ravi Megha Versha
4.	Suman Lata	422/22	323/341/509/354/ 354A/34 IPC	North Rohini	Ravi Shivam Sagar Kirshan

2. The aforementioned FIR's arise out of disputes among known persons of the same vicinity. The briefly stated facts are that the FIR No. 553/2022 was lodged on the complaint of Sh. Ravi Kumar Shukla alleging therein that his neighbour Sandeep used to throw garbage in front of his house due to the construction work going on in Sandeep's house. It was alleged that the complainant had repeatedly asked the accused to not do so and tell the same to the labourers working on his flat, it eventually led to fights and disputes amongst the parties.
3. Furthermore, FIR No. 554/2024 was lodged by the complainant(deceased) alleging therein that on 28.07.2022 Sandeep along with some other people had come to the locality of the complainant who together beat up the son and granddaughter of the complainant. It was also alleged that the accused persons assaulted and abused the complainant also.



4. Subsequently, FIR No. 590/2022 was lodged on the complaint of Ms. Neelam wherein it was alleged that one property dealer Mr. Ravi Shukla used to create hindrance in the renovation work carried out by the complainant in a flat bought in the locality where most of the flats are sold and bought by the accused Ravi Shukla. The complainant also alleged that Ravi Shukla repeatedly got into scuffles and fights with the complainant and her husband and even threatened to kill them.
5. Learned counsel for the parties submit that the parties are neighbours to each other and disputes have arisen on the petty things which now have been settled. It has been submitted that the FIR 422/2022 has already been quashed vide order passed in W.P.(CRL) bearing no. 3276/2024.
6. All parties are present in court today and have duly been identified by the IO. The parties state that they have settled their disputes amicably and undertake to live peacefully. The parties further state that they have entered into a settlement out of their own free will and without any force, coercion and threat.
7. It is settled that the inherent powers under section 482 of the Code are required to be exercised to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of any court. Further, the High Court can quash non- compoundable offences after considering the nature of the offence and the amicable settlement between the concerned parties. The Apex Court in the case of State of *Maharashtra through CBI v. Vikram Anatrai Doshi* and in the case of *Inder Singh Goswami v. State of Uttaranchal* has observed that powers under Section 482



Cr.P.C. must be exercised sparingly, carefully and with great caution. Only when the Court comes to the conclusion that there would be manifest injustice or there would be abuse of the process of the Court if such power is not exercised, Court would quash the proceedings.

8. Moreover, where the High Court is convinced that the offences are entirely personal in nature and therefore do not affect public peace or tranquillity and where it feels that quashing of such proceedings on account of compromise would bring about peace and would secure ends of justice, it should not hesitate to quash them. The same is interalia observed in *Sunil Malhotra & Anr. V. The State of Delhi and Anr.* CRL.M.C. 2167/2023.
9. Taking into account the totality of facts and circumstances of the case, this court considers that the parties have entered into an amicable settlement out of their own free will, without any fear, force or coercion and they should be given an opportunity to lead their lives peacefully. No purpose will be served in continuing with the trial.
10. In view of the above, FIR nos. 553/2022, 554/2022 and 590/2022 registered at PS Shahbad Dairy, and all the other proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.
11. The present petitions along with all the pending applications stands disposed of.

DINESH KUMAR SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 22, 2024

Pallavi/KR