



\$~118

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 9604/2024**

PARVESH GOEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Deepanshu Bansal and Mr.
Deepak Tiwari, Advs. along with
petitioner.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Manoj Pant, APP for State with
S.I. Sheetal, P.S. Mangol Puri, Delhi.
Ms. Chavi Lazarus, Adv. as *Amicus*
Curiae along with R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

28.01.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR No.228/2024 under Sections 354(A)/354(B) IPC registered at Police Station Mangol Puri, Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the ground that the parties have arrived at a settlement.
2. Issue notice. The learned APP appearing on behalf of the State accepts notice. Likewise, respondent no.2, who is present in court, also accepts notice.
3. The petitioner, as well as, respondent no.2/complainant are present in the Court and they have been identified by their respective counsel, as well as, by the Investigating Officer i.e. S.I. Sheetal, P.S. Mangol Puri, Delhi.



4. The case of the prosecution in brief is that an FIR was registered at the instance of respondent no.2 alleging that she was working as a housemaid in the house of the petitioner when the petitioner misbehaved with her.

5. During the pendency of proceedings, the parties have arrived at a settlement.

6. The respondent no.2, who is present in court, affirms the factum of settlement and states that since she had not been paid her salary, therefore, by way of compromise, the petitioner has agreed to compensate her for the same.

7. In terms of the said settlement, the petitioner has paid an amount of Rs.2,30,000/- to the respondent no.2, receipt of which is acknowledged by the respondent no.2.

8. The respondent no.2, on a query posed by the Court, states that she has no objection in case the FIR is quashed.

9. At this stage, apt would it be to refer to the observations of the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303: (SCC p. 340, para 58)***

“58. Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor.”

10. In view of the settlement between the parties, the ultimate chances of conviction in the case are bleak, therefore, continuation of criminal proceedings will not serve any useful purpose and it will be an exercise in futility.



11. It is, thus, in the interest of justice that the present FIR and all the other proceedings emanating therefrom be quashed.
12. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.228/2024 under Sections 354(A)/354(B) IPC registered at Police Station Mangol Puri, Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, is quashed.
13. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.
14. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

JANUARY 28, 2025

aj

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J