

\$~4/29

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

+ CRL.M.C. 4249/2018

SH. JITENDER WADHWA @ GOLU Petitioner
Through Mr.Ashutosh Bhardwaj, Adv. with
Petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT DELHI) & ANR. Respondents
Through Ms.Manjeet Arya, APP for the State.
SI Mukesh Yadav, PS Jagatpuri.
Respondent no.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE REKHA PALLI

ORDER

% **26.11.2018**

Crl.M.A. No.47893/2018 (for impleadment)

1. Vide the present application, the applicant/Mr.Aditya Pandey who was the co-accused in the FIR No.0542/2015 registered u/s 324/341/307/34 IPC at Police Station Jagatpuri, seeks impleadment as a co-petitioner in the present petition. Learned counsel for the petitioner has handed over an amended memo of parties in Court which is taken on record.
2. Issue notice. Ms.Manjeet Arya, learned APP accepts notice and does not oppose the application.
3. For the reasons stated in the application, the same is allowed. The applicant/Mr.Aditya Pandey is impleaded as petitioner no.2 in the present petition.

4. The application is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

CRL.M.C. 4249/2018

1. Vide the present petition filed u/s 482 Cr.P.C., the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.0542/2015 registered u/s 324/341/307/34 IPC at Police Station Jagatpuri, Delhi on the basis of a Compromise Deed dated 16th August, 2018.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners as also the respondent no.2 are neighbours living in Gopal Park, Jagatpuri. Due to a misunderstanding, a quarrel took place between the parties on 8th September, 2015, as a result of which the respondent no.2 sustained simple injuries. Consequently, the respondent no.2 filed a complaint which led to the registration of the aforesaid FIR against the petitioners.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that after the registration of the FIR, the parties with the intervention of senior members of the locality, have now resolved their disputes and have entered into a Compromise Deed dated 16th August, 2018. He submits that keeping in view the fact that the nature of the alleged injury caused to the respondent no.2 is simple and that the parties have already resolved their disputes, the captioned FIR and proceedings emanating therefrom be quashed.

4. The petitioners as also the respondent no.2 are present in Court and have been identified by the Investigating Officer. I have interacted with the respondent no.2 who states that he has decided to resolve all his differences with the petitioners of his own free will and has entered into the settlement without any coercion. He further

submits that he does not want the aforesaid criminal proceedings to continue as he does not want any further acrimony with the petitioners who are his neighbours.

5. I have considered the submissions of the learned counsel for the parties and perused the records. Keeping in view the fact that the parties are neighbours as also the fact that the altercation between them arose out of a misunderstanding, I find that no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the criminal proceedings as the same will not only cause hardship to the parties but also cause further acrimony between them.

6. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the captioned FIR and consequential proceedings are quashed, subject to the petitioners paying a sum of Rs.20,000/- each as costs to the Delhi High Court Bar Association Library Fund within two weeks from today. A copy of the receipt of deposit of costs will be handed over to the Investigating Officer.

7. The petition is disposed of in the above terms.

REKHA PALLI, J

NOVEMBER 26, 2018/aa