



\$~48

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 7454/2024 CRL.M.A. 28456/2024**
ARVINDER SINGH & ANR.Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sundeep Srivastava and Mr. Paran
Kumar Advs.

versus

THE STATE OF DELHI & ANR.Respondent
Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for the State
with SI Jagat Singh, PS: Connaught
Place.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANISH DAYAL

ORDER
12.11.2024

%

1. Pursuant to the previous order dated 20th September, 2024, counsel for petitioner states that respondent no.2 (*the father of the deceased victim*) has been paid Rs. 5,46,000/- previously (*Rs. 1,10,000/- by cheque, Rs. 25,000/- cash, and Rs. 4,11,000/- by demand draft*)
2. Additionally, pursuant to the submissions by the APP for State, petitioner has now paid another Rs. 2,00,000/- to respondent no.2, who has received it in Court and duly acknowledges the same.
3. Though, a settlement agreement dated 3rd July, 2024 had been arrived at with the facilitation of the Delhi Mediation Centre, Patiala House Courts in this FIR no. 211/2016 dated 07th August, 2016 registered at Police Station Connaught Place, under Sections 285/304A IPC; pursuant to the proceedings



before this Court, the additional amount of Rs. 2,00,000/- has been provided to respondent no. 2 for amelioration of his loss.

4. The issue of whether the deceased was employed with the petitioner who were the contractors working on a restaurant premises in Connaught Place, is not fully established.

5. While the statement of the uncle of the deceased who was working at the premises notes that the deceased had come to visit him, respondent no.2 has stated that he was working at the premises, however, no statement has been recorded in that regard.

6. Notwithstanding this issue, respondent no.2, who is assisted by a counsel, is satisfied by this additional amount beyond the settlement amount which was already agreed to, and has no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

7. Considering the above settlement between the parties and the chances of conviction of the petitioners being remote and bleak, there is no use continuing with proceedings of the present FIR as it would be a misuse of the process of the Court and an unnecessary burden on the State exchequer. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. Consequently, the FIR no. 211/2016 dated 07th August, 2016 registered at Police Station Connaught Place, under Sections 285/304A IPC, and proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

8. Parties shall abide by the terms of settlement.

9. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of. Pending applications (if any) are disposed of as infructuous.

10. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

ANISH DAYAL, J

NOVEMBER 12, 2024/RK/sc