



\$~106

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 8780/2024**

HC RAJA RAM

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr Dhananjay Sehrawat, Adv.
Petitioner in person.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms Shubhi Gupta, APP for State
SI Mahesh Chand, PS-Badarpur

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE JASMEET SINGH

ORDER

11.11.2024

%

CRL.M.A. 33595/2024

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 8780/2024

3. This is a petition filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') [earlier Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC')] seeking quashing of the order dated 16.04.2024 passed by the learned ACMM (South-East), Saket Courts, New Delhi in CT CASES 2055/2023 titled '*Sant Ram v. HC Raja Ram*' and subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom.
4. The complainant Sh. Sant Ram (now deceased) had registered a complaint under Section 200 Cr.P.C for cognizance of offences under



Sections of 324/325/506 IPC on the ground that the petitioner had beaten Sh. Sant Ram and broken his right hand as well as caused head injury. On the basis of complaint, under Section 156(3) of Cr.P.C, registration of FIR was directed against the petitioner *vide* order dated 16.04.2024 by the learned ACMM. The order dated 16.04.2024 was stayed by the learned ASJ-03 (South East), Saket Courts, Delhi on 25.04.2024.

5. During the pendency of the proceedings, Sh. Sant Ram expired on 18.12.2023. The petitioner on 13.09.2024 entered into a settlement with wife of the deceased Smt. Vidya (since the other legal heirs are minor children) wherein the parties have agreed to settle their disputes.

6. The petitioner is present in Court and has been identified by his counsel Mr Dhananjay Sehrawat.

7. Smt. Vidya, wife of the deceased-complainant is also present in Court today and has been identified by the IO SI Mahesh Chand, PS-Badarpur. Smt. Vidya states that she wants to put a quietus to the entire matter and has no objection to the petition being allowed.

8. Both the parties state that they have entered into the aforesaid settlement out of their own free will, volition and without any threat, force, undue influence or coercion.

9. Mr Sehrawat, learned counsel for the petitioner states that the petitioner out of his own free will and volition will pay a sum of Rs. 25,000/- to Smt. Vidya, wife of the deceased-complainant by way of demand draft within a period of four weeks from today and will file a copy of the same with the Registry.

10. 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 about 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. It is a fit case for quashing. In this view of the matter, there is no reason to continue the proceedings.

11. For the reasons stated above, the order dated 16.04.2024 passed by the learned ACMM (South-East), Saket Courts, New Delhi in CT. CASES 2055/2023 titled '*Sant Ram v. HC Raja Ram*' and subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom is hereby quashed subject to payment of Rs. 25,000/- to be paid by the petitioner to Smt. Vidya, wife of the deceased-complainant, by way of demand draft as agreed within a period of four weeks from today.

12. The proof of payment shall be filed in the Registry within 1 week thereafter and in case the same is not furnished, this file be put up before the Court.

13. The petition is disposed of accordingly.

JASMEET SINGH, J

NOVEMBER 11, 2024

sr

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)