



\$~45

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2529/2019**

ANIL VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. S.K. Bhaduri, Mr. Prem Prakash,
Ms. Neetu Gupta, Ms. Shreyangana
Bag and Ms. Rimpay, Advocates.

versus

STATE & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amol Sinha, ASC for the State
with Mr. Kshitiz Garg, Mr. Ashvini
Kumar, Mr. Nitish Dhawan and Mss.
Chavi Lazarus, Advocates with SI
Bhawna Phogat, PS Gandhi Nagar.
Mr. Vishesh Wadhwa, Advocate
(DHCLSC) with Ms. Swadha Gupta
and Mr. Vishwan Mishra, Advocates
for R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

23.04.2025

%

1. Petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 has been filed on behalf of the Petitioner, Mr. Anil Verma for quashing the FIR No. 302/2017 under Section 323/354/354-B/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Gandhi Nagar, Delhi.
2. Issue Notice.
3. On advance Notice, Mr. Amol Sinha, learned ASC has appeared for



the State.

4. It is submitted that the Petitioners are the paternal uncle and his son while the Complainant/Respondent No. 2 is the daughter of younger brother of Mr. Anil Verma. It is submitted that the matter has now been amicably settled *vide* Settlement Deed dated 17.07.2019 and thereby the FIR be quashed.

5. The Respondent No. 2 on whose behalf the Statement was made on previous date that the Settlement is only in respect of the property and not in this FIR, was directed to appear personally but again she has chosen to appear through video-conferencing, on the pretext of having a small child.

6. On the earlier date, she was represented by Counsel, Ms Shubhangi Singh and today, again she has appeared and stated that now she has the instructions from the Respondent No. 2 that she does not want to continue with the matter and agrees to the quashing of the FIR.

7. The Respondent No. 2 is present through video-conferencing, who on questioning, has stated that there was a dispute in the property in which they were residing, which she claims to be an ancestral property. She further concedes and agrees that a sum of Rs.32,00,000/- were taken by her and her brother for vacating the property. She also admits that she had made this Complaint while the dispute in regard to the property was going on.

8. It is quiet evident from her admissions that the FIR was essentially prompted by the property dispute and after having got the money to vacate the property, she entered into this Agreement and to quash the FIR. She has categorically stated on specific queries that she does not want to pursue the matter and has no objection to the quashing of FIR.

9. The Petitioner No 1, Mr. Anil Verma is present in the Court. The



Settlement bears the signatures of the Petitioner No.1 as, well as, the Complainant.

10. In view of asserting that the Statement by the Respondent No. 2 is being made voluntarily and also considering the background in which the Case got registered, the FIR No. 302/2017 under Section 323/354/354-B/34 of the IPC registered at Police Station Gandhi Nagar, Delhi along with the all the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

11. The Petition stands disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

APRIL 23, 2025/RS