

Manoj Kumar & Ors. Vs.state & Ors.

Manoj Kumar & Ors. Vs.state & Ors.

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1224724

Court : Delhi

Decided On : Aug-19-2019

Appellant : Manoj Kumar & Ors.

Respondent : State & Ors.

Judgement :

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI Date of Order: August 19, 2019 + CRL.M.C. 4028/2019 MANOJ KUMAR & ORS.Petitioners Through: Mr. Ashok Kumar Tanwar and Ms. Jyoti Bharti, Advocates versus STATE & ORS. Through: Mr. Izhar Ahmad, AdditionalRespondents Public Prosecutor for respondent- State with SI Madan Lal

... RESPONDENTS

No.2 to 5 in person CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL GAUR

ORDER

(ORAL) CRL.M.A.33574/2019 (Exemption) Allowed subject to all just exceptions. CRL.M.C. 4028/2019 Quashing of FIR No.302/2018, under Sections 323/452/506/4

of IPC, registered at Police Station Sector-23 Dwarka, Delhi is sought on the basis of affidavits of

... RESPONDENTS

No.2 to 5. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that due to inadvertence, the name of co-accused-Arun was left out and has handed over Amended Memo of Parties impleading co-accused - Arun s/o Sh. Jai Prakash in CRL.M.C. 4028/2019 Page 1 of 3 this petition. The Amended Memo of Parties is taken on record. Upon notice, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent No.1-State submits that respondents No.2 to 5, present in the Court, are the complainant/party of FIR in question and they have been identified to be so, by SI Madan Lal on the basis of identity proof produced by them. Respondent No.2-Swati Surhatia, wife of petitioner No.1, submits that the misunderstanding, which led to registration of the FIR in question, now stands cleared between the parties and she is happily residing with petitioner No.1- husband for the last one year.

... RESPONDENTS

No.2 to 5 affirm the contents of their affidavits supporting this petition and submits that now no grievance against petitioners survives and so, to restore cordiality between the parties, who are related to each other, the proceedings arising out of the FIR in question be brought to an end against all the accused. Supreme Court in *Parbatbhai Aahir @ Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Vs. State of Gujarat* (2017) 9 SCC641 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 CRL.M.C. 4028/2019 Page 2 of 3 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. The subject matter of this FIR arises from matrimonial dispute, which stands mutually and amicably settled between parties, and so, continuance of proceedings arising

out of the FIR in question would be an exercise in futility as misunderstanding between the parties now stands cleared. Consequentially, this petition is allowed subject to costs of 10,000/- to be deposited by petitioners with Prime Ministers National Relief Fund within a week from today. Upon placing on record the proof of deposit of costs within a week thereafter and handing over its copy to the Investigating Officer, FIR No.302/2018, under Sections 323/452/506/4 of IPC, registered at Police Station Sector-23, Dwarka, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom shall stand quashed. This petition is accordingly disposed of. Dasti. AUGUST19 2019 v (SUNIL GAUR) JUDGE CRL.M.C. 4028/2019 Page 3 of 3