



\$~79

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 3031/2024 & CRL.M.A. 29464/2024**
PREM SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rahul Kumar, Adv.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) AND OTHERS

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Anand V Khatri, ASC
SI Arvind Kumar, PS Mandir Marg

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER
25.11.2024

%

1. This is a petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') seeking quashing of the FIR No. 94/2024, dated 05.09.2024 registered at PS Mandir Marg under Sections 281/125(a) IPC, 1860 along with 184/185 Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, if any.
2. Briefly stating the facts are that the FIR No. 94/2024 came to be registered on the complaint of respondent no. 2 wherein the allegation against the petitioner is that the car of the petitioner had hit the bullock cart of respondent no. 2. At the time of collision respondent no. 3 and 4 were also sitting in the bullock cart. It is stated that respondent nos. 2-4 faced injuries due to the collision.
3. Hence the FIR came to be registered.



4. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have arrived at a settlement by way of a Compromise Deed dated 23.09.2024. As per the settlement, the parties have agreed to settle their disputes and respondent nos. 2-4 will cooperate in quashing of the FIR. In addition, the petitioner will pay a sum of Rs. 60,000/- to respondent nos. 2-4.
5. It is stated that a sum of Rs. 60,000/- has already been paid to respondent nos. 2-4 and respondent nos. 2-4 have no objection if the FIR is quashed.
6. The petitioner i.e. Sh Prem Singh is present in Court and has been identified by his counsel i.e. Mr. Rahul Kumar, Adv. Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 are also present in Court and have been identified by SI Arvind Kumar, PS Mandir Marg.
7. Since the parties have arrived at a settlement and no disputes are pending, I am convinced that quashing of such proceedings on account of compromise would bring peace and would secure ends of justice. The Court does not see any fruitful purpose if criminal proceedings are permitted to be prosecuted any further.
8. In this view of the matter, there is no reason to continue the proceedings, however, I am inclined to impose costs as the said act committed by the petitioner is due to his negligence and the same has wasted both the judicial and the time of the police. In addition the said act has also caused injuries to respondent nos. 2-4.
9. Thus, the petitioner is directed to pay costs of Rs. 20,000/- to DSLSA within 4 weeks from today.
10. The proof of payment be filed with the Registry within 6 weeks, failing which the file shall be put up before the Court.



11. For the reasons noted above and in view of the settlement, the petition is allowed and and FIR No. 94/2024, dated 05.09.2024 registered at PS Mandir Marg under Sections 281/125(a) IPC, 1860 along with 184/185 Motor Vehicles Act, 1988 and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, if any are quashed.
12. The petition is disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

JASMEET SINGH, J

NOVEMBER 25, 2024 / (MS)

Click here to check corrigendum, if any