



\$~36

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

+ CRL.M.C. 731/2025

HIMANSHU & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr.Sanjay Manchanda, Advocate
alongwith Petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State.
Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Advocate for
Respondents alongwith Respondents
in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

01.09.2025

%

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of FIR No. 267/2018, dated 01.07.2018, registered at P.S. Ambedkar Nagar, under Sections 324 and 34 of IPC, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.
2. The complainants (respondent nos. 2 & 3) alleged that they were attacked on 30.06.2018 with a knife and they suspected it was done by the petitioners.
3. Learned Counsels for the petitioners submit that the parties live in the same locality. It is further submitted that, during the pendency of the proceedings, the Petitioners and Respondents have entered into a MOU/ Settlement Deed dated 22.01.2025 which is placed on record



(Annexure P-3). He further submits that an affidavit of no objection to the quashing, deposed by respondent no. 2 and respondent no. 3, has also been placed on record.

4. Both the counsel for Respondent No. 2 and the learned APP for the State concur with the factum of the compromise between the parties. Learned counsel for complainants convey his no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard the counsel and interacted with the complainant who is present in Court.

6. The parties are present in Court, and I have interacted with Respondents (complainants/ victims) who are present in person. It so appears that they have settled their differences without any duress and coercion and out of their free will.

7. Though respondent no.2/complainant namely, Vikas Kumar remained hospitalized as he suffered serious injuries and was fortunate to have survived without those turning fatal, but having seen the contents of the FIR, and in view of the statement of the respondent nos.2 and 3, as above, it appears that Petitioners were merely suspected by Respondent no. 2. There is nothing else otherwise to show that the petitioners were the assailant or the assailants were sent on their behest.

8. Subsequently, it turned out that Respondent no.2 regretted having suspected the Petitioners. Both the respondents do not now wish to prosecute any charges against the petitioner. They desire to preserve their cordial relations and future bonhomie with each other, as they have mutually settled their dispute.

9. Since the complainants do not wish to press charges against the petitioners and there is no incriminating material against them, the chances



of conviction are almost negligible.

10. Further criminal proceedings before the court and continuation of the trial would therefore be an abuse of the process of law. It will be an exercise in futility and wasteful expense of public exchequer, especially where the parties have amicably settled their dispute which does not involve any public interest or interest of the society at large. Reference in this context may also be made to judgment rendered in the case of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

11. The instant petition is thus allowed. The criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No. 267/2018, dated 01.07.2018, registered at P.S. Ambedkar Nagar, under Sections 324 and 34 of IPC against the petitioner and further proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

12. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 1, 2025/rs/nk