

\$~16

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 5876/2018**

ANIL & ORS

..... Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pratyush Chirantan and Mr.
Abhishek Bajpai, Advs.

Versus

THE STATE & ORS

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Chadha, APP for State with
SI Vidyakar Pathak, P.S. Anand
Parbat.
Ms. Santosh, Adv. for R- 2 to R-8
along with R-2 to R-6 and R-8 in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE A.K. PATHAK

ORDER

%

10.01.2019

Petitioners and respondent nos. 2 to 8 are neighbours. A quarrel took place between them on some trivial issue wherein both the parties sustained injuries. This incident had led to registration of cross FIRs. It is further submitted that cross FIR No. 152/2018 under Sections 308/323/324/34 IPC registered at police station Anand Parbat has already been quashed in view of the compromise arrived at between the petitioners and respondent nos. 2 to 8.

Learned APP submits that in FIR No. 152/2018 victims had sustained

only simple injuries; whereas in the present FIR, that is, FIR No.148/2018 under Sections 308/324/34 IPC Police Station Anand Parbat, respondent nos. 2 and 4 have sustained grievous/dangerous injuries. It is noted that neither the petitioners nor the private respondents were armed with any weapon. They had hurled stones on each other.

Respondent nos. 2 to 6 and 8 are present in Court and have been identified by SI Vidyakar Pathak of police station Anand Parbat. Respondent no. 7 is mother of respondent no.6 and is not present in Court. It is submitted that she is confined to bed. Respondent nos. 2 to 6 and 8 submit that in order to maintain harmonious relations with each other they have settled their disputes with petitioners of their own free will and without any undue force, pressure or coercion and they have no objection in case the present FIR and the consequent proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed. Respondent no. 6 further submits that he has instructions from his mother, that is, respondent no. 7 that she also has no objection if the FIR is quashed. Affidavits of private respondents are also on record to this effect.

Keeping in mind the settlement arrived at between the petitioners and respondent nos. 2 to 8 voluntarily, in my view, no fruitful purpose would be served to keep the criminal proceedings pending. Accordingly, in the

interest of justice, aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

Petition is disposed of in the above terms.

Dasti.

A.K. PATHAK, J.

JANUARY 10, 2019

ga