

\$~38

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1835/2017**

SUJEET @ SURJEET & ORS

..... Petitioners

Represented by: **Mr. Alok Bharti, Adv.**

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ORS

..... Respondents

Represented by: **Mr. Shahsank Vachher, Adv.**
for **Mr. Avi Singh, ASC**
Insp. Vijay Kumar, SI Ombir,
ASI Devi Ram, P.S. Nand
Nagri

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MUKTA GUPTA

ORDER

05.04.2018

%

CRL.M.A.10174/2017

Exemption allowed subject to just exceptions.

W.P.(CRL) 1835/2017

By this petition, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.06/2016 under Sections 323/341/34 IPC registered at PS Nand Nagri on the ground of settlement. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties have settled the matter.

Learned proxy counsel for the learned Additional Standing Counsel submits that initially above noted FIR was registered under Sections 323/341/34 IPC at PS Nand Nagri, however the injured was not fit for

W.P.(CRL) 1835/2017

Page 1 of 2

making the statement. Thus the Investigating Officer of his own added Section 307 IPC. However, after the MLC of the injured was received charge sheet has been filed for offences punishable under Sections 308/323/341/506/34 of the IPC. The above noted FIR is a sequel to an earlier FIR No.923/2015 registered on the complaint of respondent No.3, brother of respondent No.2 complainant herein. FIR No.923/2015 under Section 307 and 27 of the Arms Act has been registered at PS Nand Nagri. The allegations were of firing gunshot. Thus when the earlier petition came up before this Court for quashing of FIR No.923/2015 under Sections 307 IPC and 27 of the Arms Act registered at PS Nand Nagri, this Court declined to quash the FIR. Petitioner No.1 was declared a proclaimed offender in FIR No.923/2015. After the registration of FIR No.923/2015 the petitioners are alleged to have beaten the respondent No.2 complainant of the above noted FIR and respondent No.3 the complainant in FIR No.923/2015 to teach them a lesson for filing complaint against them. Injuries have been inflicted to the victim in the above noted FIR.

For the facts noted above this Court finds no ground for quashing of the FIR in question on the basis of settlement between the parties.

Petition is dismissed.

MUKTA GUPTA, J.

APRIL 05, 2018
‘ns’