

\$~ 37

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

+ CRL.M.C. 345/2022  
CRL.M.A. 1488/2022

MOHD. NAZIM ..... Petitioner  
Represented by: Mr.R.N.Sharma, Advocate.

Versus

THE STATE (G.N.C.T. OF DELHI) & ANR. .... Respondent  
Represented by: Mr.Amit Gupta, APP for the State  
with SI Deepak, P.S.Sarai Rohilla.  
Mr.Sanjeev Kumar Malhotra,  
Advocate for respondent No. 2.

**CORAM:**  
**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA**

**ORDER**  
**25.01.2022**

%

The hearing has been conducted through video conferencing.

CRL.M.A. 1488/2022 (exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to just exceptions.
2. Application is disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 345/2022

1. By this petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No. 523/2015 under Sections 354(A)/354(D)/341/506/507/509 IPC registered at P.S. Sarai Rohilla on the complaint of respondent No.2 and the proceedings pursuant thereto on the ground that the parties have entered into a settlement.
2. The allegations of the complainant in the above-noted FIR were that

as an undergraduate girl when the complainant used to go for coaching, the petitioner who was also taking coaching, followed her and offered her for friendship. When she refused his friendship, the petitioner started pressurizing her to have friendship with him and thus the complainant informed about this to her mother. The complainant had to leave her coaching and thereafter, started doing the job of applying mehndi. While she used to go for her job, the petitioner used to stop her on the way and when she revealed this to her mother, her mother went to the house of the petitioner and complained to the parents of the petitioner, who assured that no such incident will take place in future. The complainant got married on 24<sup>th</sup> October 2014 and after 15 days of marriage, the petitioner called her from an unknown number, which fact she disclosed to her husband and the petitioner told the husband of the complainant that the complainant was not a good girl and he should leave her, so that the petitioner could marry her. The husband of the complainant advised the petitioner not to do so and thereafter, for sometime no call was received. However, after few days, the petitioner again started calling the complainant, asked her to meet him and threatened that if she failed to do so, he would throw acid on her. On the complainant stating that she was already married and there was no relationship between them, the petitioner, continued to harass her and kept extending threats. For the last one month before lodging of the FIR, the grievance of the complainant was that many persons started visiting her and pressurized her to open the door of the house, claiming that they had come from V-Chat as the petitioner had called them and that how much she would charge for one hour, whether she is the same person whose photographs had been sent to them and whether she was all alone. Thereafter, calls started

receiving on the mobile phone number of the sister-in-law of the complainant as well from the mobile number of the petitioner, asking about charges for one night of the complainant. When several people started visiting the house of the complainant, showing her dirty pictures on V-Chat Site, the complainant was constrained to lodge the FIR in question against the petitioner.

3. After the investigation, charge sheet in the above-noted FIR has been filed and the petitioner claims that now the petitioner has settled the matter with the complainant vide the compromise deed dated 7<sup>th</sup> January 2022.

4. Considering the fact that the petitioner not only used to stop, harass, stalk and threaten the complainant but also circulated her morphed photographs on V-Chat, resulting in number of people visiting her place asking about illegal favours from her on payment of money, the alleged offences committed by the petitioner against the complainant cannot be said to be a personal dispute not affecting the society at all. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner is now repentant and has reformed. The nature of offence committed by the petitioner against the complainant cannot be quashed merely on the ground that the petitioner now shows repentance as the offence committed is a serious assault on the fundamental right to live with dignity of the complainant.

5. Considering the nature of allegations, this Court does not find it a fit case for quashing of the FIR in question on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

6. Petition is dismissed.
7. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

**MUKTA GUPTA, J.**

**JANUARY 25, 2022/akb**