



\$~73

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+

CRL.M.C. 7646/2024, CRL.M.A. 29163/2024

PRASHANT KUMAR BHARTI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajan Sharma, Mr. Rudra Pratap Singh, Mr. Dheeraj Kumar, Mr. Narender Sharma, Mr. Naushad Ali and Mr. Dinesh Kumar Baghel, Advs. with petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for State with SI Sohan Lal, PS Tigri. Mr. Anis Ahmad and Mr. Jitendra Berwal, Advocates for R-2 with R-2 (through V.C.).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ KUMAR OHRI

ORDER

%

26.09.2024

1. The present proceedings are instituted under Article 227 of the Constitution of India on behalf of the petitioner seeking quashing of FIR No. 194/2023 registered under Sections 394/397 IPC at Police Station Tigri, Delhi on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes.
2. As per the allegations levelled in the FIR, the petitioner intimidated and snatched the mobile phone of the respondent No.2 by threatening him with a pistol-like object.
3. Learned APP for the State, on instructions, submits that the petitioner is the only accused and respondent No. 2 is the only complainant/victim in the present case. It is further submitted that the offence is pending investigation. Learned APP further states that no pistol was recovered from the petitioner. Complainant/respondent no. 2 submits that it was something



resembling a pistol.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the present FIR was registered due to misunderstanding and with the intervention of family members and friends, parties have amicably settled their disputes vide Memorandum of Understanding dated 16.09.2024, a copy of which has been placed on record. In terms of the said settlement, complainant/respondent No. 2 is now left with no claim or grievance against the petitioner.

5. The petitioner, who is present in Court, has been identified by his counsel as well as the I.O./SI Sohan Lal, PS Tigri, Delhi who is present in the Court. Respondent No. 2 is also present through video-conferencing 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 entered into the aforementioned MOU 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. In view of the above facts and considering 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.

9. With the above directions, the petition is disposed of alongwith pending application.

MANOJ KUMAR OHRI, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2024

akc