



\$~110

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 9385/2024 & CRL.M.A. 35987/2024**
SANDEEP CHHABRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. MY Khan, Adv.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Kr. Gautam, APP
SI Deepak Malik, PS Barakhambha Road
Mr. Ateev Mathur, Mr. Ajay Monga and Mr.
Rajnish Gaur, Advocates

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
02.12.2024

%

CRL.M.A. 35986/2024

Allowed subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 9385/2024

1. This is a petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 seeking quashing of the FIR No. 20/2010 registered at Barakhambha Road under Sections 408/420 of IPC.
2. In the present case, the petitioner was an employee of the Standard Chartered Bank and was a Customer Care Executive. Certain irregularities were observed by the respondent No.2 based on the complaint of one of the customers.
3. In the present case, the petitioner is represented by his duly authorised



representative.

4. Since the petitioner fairly admitted the lapses on his part, the petitioner paid a sum of Rs. 65,17,823.93/- towards the irregularities caused by the petitioner.
5. However, the respondent No.2 was of the view that the irregularities were for a larger amount. Hence, the petitioner was terminated.
6. Since the petitioner did not make the payment, the FIR in question was registered.
7. Thereafter, another settlement was executed between the parties, wherein the petitioner paid another sum of Rs. 32,83,000/- making the total amount as Rs. 98 lakhs paid to the respondent No.2. The said amount was accepted by the respondent No.2 in full and final settlement towards the monetary claims. Hence, the present petition.
8. The respondent No.2 has settled the amounts with the petitioner and there are no other amounts due and payable by the petitioner for the irregularity caused while in employment with the respondent No.2, I am of the view that the issue in controversy has been put to rest.
9. The respondent is a private bank. Since the entire amount as claimed by the bank has been paid by the petitioner, I am of the view that the claims of the respondent No.2 no longer will survive.
10. In case the proceedings are permitted to be continued, the same would be waste of judicial time and resources which, according to me, is very precious.
11. Since the parties have arrived at a settlement and no disputes are pending, I am convinced that quashing of such proceedings would bring about peace and would secure ends of justice. The Court does not



see any fruitful purpose if criminal proceedings are permitted to be prosecuted any further. It is a fit case for quashing. In this view of the matter, there is no reason to continue the proceedings.

12. However, I am of the view that valuable time of the police as well as judicial time has been consumed which could have been and should have been better utilised, subject to the petitioner depositing costs of Rs. 25,000/- with the Delhi High Court Bar Association (DHCBA) within a period of 4 weeks from today, the FIR No. 20/2010 registered at Barakhambha Road under Sections 408/420 of IPC and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.
13. The proof of payment shall be filed within 6 weeks with the Registry, Delhi High Court, failing which the file will be put up before the Court.
14. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

DECEMBER 2, 2024 / (MS)

Click here to check corrigendum, if any