



\$~9

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3410/2023

TARLOK SINGH

..... Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ajay Sharma and Mr. Mehul
Sharma, Advocates with petitioner in
person.

versus

THE STATE & ANR

..... Respondents

Through: Mr. Laksh Khanna, APP for State
with SI Sanjeet Dagar, PS Janakpuri,
New Delhi.
Respondent No.2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

% **11.01.2024**

1. The present proceedings are instituted under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No. 624/2014 registered under Section 307/34 IPC at Police Station Janakpuri, New Delhi on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the complainant, accused *Charanjeet Singh @ Sukha Channu* and the petitioner were all working in Janakpuri Authority and some quarrel took place between them, leading to injuries to the complainant.
3. Mr. Laksh Khanna, learned APP for the State, on instructions, submits that the petitioner is the only remaining accused person and respondent No.2 is the only complainant/victim in the present case. It is further submitted that the case is at the stage of prosecution evidence.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner states that charge-sheet has been



filed against the present petitioner as well as against the other accused *Charanjeet Singh @ Taranjeet Singh @ Sukha Channu* (since deceased). It is further submitted that as per the prosecution case, it was actually *Late Charanjeet Singh* who had inflicted the knife injuries on the complainant and the role assigned to the present petitioner was only of catching hold of the victim. It is further stated that the petitioner is not involved in any other case. It is further stated that the parties are known to each other and that they have amicably settled their dispute vide Memorandum of Settlement dated 01.05.2023. In terms of the settlement, the complainant is left with no claim or grievance against the petitioner.

5. The petitioner, who are present in Court, has been identified by his counsel as well as the I.O./ SI Sanjeet Dagar, PS Janakpuri, New Delhi. Respondent No. 2 is also present in Court and has been identified by the I.O.

6. The petitioner has shown remorse for his conduct and undertakes not to repeat the same in future. Respondent No. 2 also states that he has settled the matter out of his own free will, volition and without any coercion. He further states that he has no objection if the present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed.

7. The parties shall remain bound by the statements made in Court today.

8. Considering the role assigned to the petitioner as also the fact that no other case is pending against him and in view of the fact that no useful purpose will be served in continuance of the proceedings, it is directed that the aforesaid FIR and the consequent proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed, subject to payment of cost of Rs.25,000/- out of which Rs.15,000/- shall paid to respondent No.2/complainant by way of demand



draft through IO and the remaining amount of Rs.10,000/- shall be deposited by the petitioner with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority within a period of two weeks from today. The amount so deposited shall be utilized by the Delhi State Legal Services Authority for providing counselling/psychological support to POCSO victims requiring such assistance.

9. Proof evidencing receipt of deposit shall be filed with the I.O. as well as in Court.

10. A copy of this order be communicated to the Member Secretary, Delhi State Legal Services Authority for intimation.

11. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

JANUARY 11, 2024/rd