

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
Date of Order: April 30, 2019

+ **CRL.M.C. 2316/2019 & CRL.M.A. 9203/2019**

VIKRAM MEHTO Petitioner
Through: Mr. H. Rehman, Advocate.

Versus

THE STATE & ANR Respondents
Through: Mr. M.P. Singh, Additional Public
Prosecutor for State with ASI
Praveen Kumar Sharma.
Respondent No. 2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER
(ORAL)

Quashing of FIR No. 819/2014, under Sections 354/354-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Bawana, Delhi is sought on the basis of affidavit of 16th April, 2019 of respondent No. 2 and on the ground that the misunderstanding which led to registration of the FIR in question, now stands cleared between the parties.

Upon notice, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submits that respondent No. 2 present in the Court, is the complainant/first-informant of FIR in question and she has been identified to be so, by ASI Praveen Kumar Sharma, on the basis of identity proof produced by her.

Respondent No. 2 present in the Court, submits that the misunderstanding, which led to registration of the FIR in question, now stands cleared between the parties and now, no grievance against petitioner survives and so, to restore cordiality between the parties, proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be brought to an end.

Supreme Court in *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Vs. State of Gujarat* (2017) 9 SCC 641 has reiterated the parameters for exercising inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 Cr.P.C. for quashing of FIR / criminal proceedings, which are as under:-

“16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice.”

In the facts and circumstances of this case, I find that continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility as the misunderstanding, which led to registration of the FIR in question, now stands cleared amongst the parties.

Accordingly, FIR No. 819/2014, under Sections 354/354-B of IPC, registered at Police Station Bawana, Delhi and the proceedings emanating

therefrom are hereby quashed qua petitioner.

This petition and application are accordingly disposed of.

Dasti.

(SUNIL GAUR)
JUDGE

APRIL 30, 2019

p'ma

