



\$~62

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

+ CRL.M.C. 5138/2024

SH. BRAHAM SINGH @ LILU AND OTHERSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Vinod Kumar, Advocate with
petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE AND ANOTHER THROUGH SHO P.S. MAIDAN
GARHIRespondent

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP for
State.

Mr. Sourabh Tanwar & Mr. Sumit
Tanwar, Advocates for R-2 with R-2
in person.

A.S.I. Mithlesh Rai, PS Maidan
Garhi, Delhi.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA

ORDER

% **08.07.2024**

1. The present Petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (*hereinafter referred to as "Cr.P.C., 1973"*) has been filed on behalf of the petitioners seeking to quash the FIR No. 273/2013 registered under Sections 323/452/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (*hereinafter referred to as "IPC, 1860"*) at Police Station Maidan Garhi, Delhi.

2. Issue notice.

3. Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing on advance notice, accepts notice on behalf of the State.

4. Mr. Sourabh Tanwar, learned counsel appearing on advance notice, accepts notice on behalf of the respondent No. 2.

5. Brief facts of the case are that the respondent No. 2 was getting some



plumbing work done in his house and then, he received a phone call of his plumber who informed that Braham Singh @ Lilu wants to talk to you and when the respondent No. 2 talked to him on the phone call, he asked him to come to his house for a minute. The respondent No. 2 directly came from the Saket Court and as soon he reached his home, he found that Braham Singh @ Lilu and his two sons, namely, Rinku and Tinku entered his house with iron rods in their hands and they pulled the respondent No. 2 and gave beatings to him, however, the respondent No. 2 managed to escape from there and on 28.03.2019 on the complaint of respondent No. 2, an FIR No. 72/2019 registered under Sections 323/452/506/34 of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Maidan Garhi, Delhi.

6. It is also submitted that pursuant to the FIR, a common meeting/local Panchayat was arranged by both the parties in the Village and with the intervention of family members, friends, relatives, well wishers and respectable persons of the village, both the parties have amicably settled all the disputes and differences between them *vide* Compromise Deed dated 05.07.2024 which *inter alia* states that: -

(i) That the respondent No. 2 has no any kind of dispute with the petitioners,

(ii) That the respondent No. 2 shall cooperate in quashing the FIR.

7. In view of the Compromise Deed dated 05.07.2024, the present petition has been filed.

8. The parties are present before this Court in-person today, and have been identified by their counsel and Investigating Officer concerned.

9. The parties have submitted that all the disputes have been amicably settled *vide* Compromise Deed dated 05.07.2024 and thus, no fruitful



purpose will be served in continuing with the FIR.

10. The present petition has been signed by all the petitioners and is supported by their respective affidavits. The parties have reaffirmed the terms of the settlement arrived and they also submit that the said settlement has been arrived at between the parties without any pressure and coercion.

11. Today, the complainant/respondent No. 2, who is present in Court, states that he has settled all the disputes and he has no objection if the FIR is quashed.

12. In view of the above facts that the parties have amicably resolved their differences out of their own free will and without any coercion and also the fact that the present matter is a family matter, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the proceedings, rather the same would create further acrimony between them. Hence, it would be in the interest of justice to quash the abovementioned FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto.

13. Moreover, there is no legal impediment in quashing the FIR in question.

14. Accordingly, FIR No. 273/2013 registered under Sections 323/452/506/34 of IPC, 1860 at Police Station Maidan Garhi, Delhi for offences punishable under Sections 323/452/506/34 of IPC, 1860 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

15. The petition stands disposed of.

NEENA BANSAL KRISHNA, J

JULY 8, 2024

S.Sharma