



\$~39

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 555/2025**

SATVIK BHARDWAJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Neha Kapoor, Advocate along
with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel
(criminal) for the State with Mr.
Abhinav Kumar Arya and Mr. Aryan
Sachdeva, Advocates.
SI Sikander, P.S. H.N. Din.
Mr. Anuraag Mehta, Advocate for R-
2.
R-2 in person through VC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

28.03.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CRL.M.A. 5038/2025 (exemption)

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. The application is disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 555/2025

3. The present petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the BNSS seeks quashing of FIR No. 8/2025, under Section 281 of the BNS, registered at P.S. Hazarat Nizamuddin, Delhi and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Sh. Kartik Tapariya, learned JFMC,



Saket Courts, Delhi.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the parties live in the same vicinity and during the pendency of the proceedings, with the intervention of friends and family, the matter has been settled with respondent. In pursuance of which respondent no. 2 has no objection, if the present FIR and the subsequent chargesheet are quashed.

5. Petitioner appears in person and complainant/respondent no. 2 appear through video conferencing and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer, SI Sikander, P.S. Hazarat Nizamuddin.

6. The matter was also placed before the learned Joint Registrar who has recorded the statements of both the parties and passed the following order dated 28.02.2025:

“Today, statement of respondent no. 2 has been recorded to ascertain the veracity and the genuineness of the parties entering into settlement.

Respondent no. 2 lodged FIR No. 8/2025, Under Section 281 of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita BNS, 2023 (279 IPG) registered at PS Hazrat Nizamuddin, Delhi. His stationary vehicle was hit from behind due to which his vehicle sustained substantial damage therefore Respondent no. 2 registered the abovesaid FIR.

Thereafter, now the petitioner has paid Respondent no. 2 Rs. 57,600/- vide Cheque no. 495598 dated 08.01.2025 drawn on SBI Bank, Branch Jangpura towards the cost of damage. Respondent no. 2 and the petitioner live in the same neighborhood. Respondent no. 2 is satisfied that the incident was purely an accident done without any mala fide intention. Respondent no. 2 further states that he does not want any further compensation. Respondent no. 2 also states that he has voluntarily without any pressure or coercion from anyone out of his own free will and after obtaining due legal advice have given his no objection affidavit for quashing of the abovesaid FIR against the petitioner along with all proceedings emanating therefrom. The affidavit is at page no. 19 of the petition bearing his signatures. Respondent no. 2 undertakes to fully cooperate in quashing of the abovesaid FIR and Respondent no. 2 has also



undertakes not to initiate any further civil or criminal litigation with respect to the incident for which the abovesaid FIR was registered.

Respondent no. 2 has been identified by his counsel.

This pre verified report along with the petition may be placed before the Hon'ble Court on **24th March, 2025** alongwith statements recorded today.”

7. Respondent no. 2 submits that he has voluntarily settled with the petitioner and has no objection if the present FIR and the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet are quashed.

8. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned Standing Counsel (Crl.) for the State also has no objection if the present FIR and the consequential proceedings arising therefrom including the chargesheet are quashed, subject to cost.

9. In *Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

“61. ... In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

10. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and the fact that the parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 8/2025, under Section 281 of the BNS, registered at P.S. Hazarat Nizamuddin, Delhi and all other consequential proceedings



emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Sh. Kartik Tapariya, learned JFMC, Saket Courts, Delhi.

11. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 8/2025, under Section 281 of the BNS, registered at P.S. Hazarat Nizamuddin, Delhi and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Sh. Kartik Tapariya, learned JFMC, Saket Courts, Delhi, are hereby quashed.

12. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

13. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MARCH 28, 2025/gs

Click here to check corrigendum, if any