

---

**(2018) 12 DEL CK 0490**

**In the Delhi High Court**

**Case No :** Criminal Miscellaneous Case No. 6524 Of 2018, Criminal  
Miscellaneous Application No. 50307 Of 2018

Vinod Yadav & Ors

APPELLANT

Vs

State (Nct Of Delhi) & Anr

RESPONDENT

---

**Date of Decision :** 20-12-2018

**Acts Referred:**

Indian Penal Code, 1860 — Section 120B, 420, 506

**Citation :** (2018) 12 DEL CK 0490

**Hon'ble Judges :** Sunil Gaur, J

**Bench :** Single Bench

**Advocate :** A.K.Mehta, Neelam Sharma, U.A.Khan, Sharukh Khan

**Final Decision :** Disposed Off

---

## **Judgement**

1. Quashing of FIR No.386/2018, under Sections 420/506/120-B IPC, registered at police station Ghazipur, Delhi is sought, on the premise that the misunderstanding amongst the parties, which led to registration of FIR in question, stands cleared now.

2. Upon notice, Ms. Neelam Sharma, Additional Public Prosecutor for respondent-State submits that respondent No.2 is the complainant of FIR in question and he is present in the Court and he has been identified to be so, by SI Arun Kumar.

3. Respondent No.2 /Complainant submits that today he has received amount of Rs. 5,50,000/- by way of demand draft No.051827, dated 17th December, 2018, drawn on Allahabad Bank, from petitioners and now, no dispute with petitioners survives and so, proceedings arising out of FIR in question be brought to an end.

4. In "Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab (2012) 10 SCC 303, Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes in cases like the instant one, by observing as under:-

"Resolution of a dispute by way of a compromise between two warring groups,

therefore, should attract the immediate and prompt attention of a court which should endeavour to give full effect to the same unless such compromise is abhorrent to lawful composition of the society or would promote savagery.

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."

5. The aforesaid dictum stands reiterated by the Supreme Court in later decision in *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab* (2014) 6 SCC 466.

6. Since the misunderstanding which led to lodging of FIR in question now stands cleared, therefore, this Court finds that continuance of proceedings arising out of this FIR would be an exercise in futility.

7. Accordingly, subject to petitioners depositing costs of Rs. 25,000/-with Prime Minister's National Relief Fund within four weeks from today and placing proof of its deposit on record of this case as well as before the trial court, FIR No.386/2018, under Sections 420/506/120-B IPC, registered at police station Ghazipur, Delhi and proceedings emanating therefrom shall stand quashed.

8. This petition and application stand disposed of in aforesaid terms. Dasti.