



\$~85

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 416/2025**

MANISHA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar, Mr. Anil Sagar, Mr. Gaurav Sharma & Mr. Sachin Kumar, Advs. with Petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC (CrI.) for the State alongwith Ms. Chavi, Adv. WSI Santosh, P.S. G.T.B. Enclave. Respondent No.2 through VC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

14.05.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CRL.M.A. 3752/2025(exemption)

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. This application is disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 416/2025

3. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. seeks quashing of FIR No. 248/2021 under Sections 385/120B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. G.T.B. Enclave.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the proceedings, the latter has settled the matter with respondent no. 2/complainant *vide* a Memorandum of Understanding/Settlement Deed dated 25.01.2025 (Annexure-B), in pursuance of which respondent no. 2 also has no objection, if the present is quashed.



5. Petitioners are present before the Court and respondent no.2 is present through Video Conferencing and the parties have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer, WSI Santosh, P.S. G.T.B. Enclave.

6. The matter was also placed before the learned Joint Registrar who has recorded the statements of both the parties and passed the following order dated 05.02.2025:

“Today, statement of respondent no.2 has been recorded to ascertain the veracity and the genuineness of the parties entering into settlement.

Respondent no.2 has been identified by the IO and counsel.

Let the pre-verified statement along with this order be placed before the Hon’ble Court on 14th May, 2025.”

7. A separate statement of respondent no. 2 dated 05.05.2025 has also been recorded before the learned Joint Registrar which reads as under:-

“I am Respondent no. 2 in the present petition. At my instance, FIR No. 248/2021, Under Section 385/120-B/34 IPC, was registered at PS GTB Enclave, Delhi. The charge sheet has not been filed against the petitioners till date.

Now, I have voluntarily without any pressure or coercion from anyone and with the intervention of friends and colleagues and after obtaining due legal advice entered into MOU/settlement deed executed on 25.01.2025 with the petitioners and have settled all my issues, disputes and grievances with the petitioner. The MOU is on record as Annexure B at page 30 onwards bearing my signatures, 'settlement has arrived at with the petitioners without any monetary or any other consideration.

I undertake to remain bound by the terms of the settlement. Accordingly, I have no objections, if the FIR No. 248/2021, Under Section 385/120-B/34 IPC, registered at PS GTB Enclave, Delhi and all proceedings emanating there from are quashed against the petitioner.

I do not wish to pursue the abovesaid FIR registered against the petitioner. My affidavit of no objection for quashing of the abovesaid FIR which is on record at page no. 18 onwards of the petition bearing my signatures. I undertake not to institute any other civil or criminal proceedings against the petitioners relating to fact



and circumstances for which the abovesaid FIR was registered.

This is my true statement being made voluntarily in the presence of my counsel & IO. I fully understand the consequences of making the statement. I have signed this statement after the same has been read over to me and I have understood it.”

8. In **Gian Singh vs. 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.”

9. 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. 248/2021 under Sections 385/120B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. G.T.B. Enclave.

10. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 248/2021 under Sections 385/120 B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. G.T.B. Enclave is hereby quashed.

11. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

12. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 14, 2025/nk/sc

Click here to check corrigendum, if any