



\$~3

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

+ **CRL.M.C. 1555/2025, CRL.M.A. 6963/2025 & CRL.M.A. 6964/2025**

SH SURENDER & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Gurmit Singh &
Ms. Gurman Kaur, Advs.
Petitioners in person

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF
DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh,
APP for the State
SI Braham Parkar, PS-
Sultan Puri
Ms. Somya Chugh, Adv.
for R2
Mr. Satyender Kumar
Chopra, R2 (through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

02.07.2025

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 904/2003 dated 29.07.2003, registered at Police Station Sultanpuri, for offences under Sections 448/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (**IPC**), including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. The chargesheet has been filed in the present case.

2. The FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2 alleging that he had purchased the property bearing no. R-1/34, Budh Vihar, Phase-I from one Ms. Savitri Devi (mother of the petitioners). It is alleged on 02.08.2002, Ms. Savitri Devi along with her two sons had trespassed on the said premises and broken the locks with the intention of usurping



possession of the same. When Respondent No. 2 objected and tried to stop the accused persons, they threatened to kill him. The said incident led to registration of the above-mentioned FIR.

3. It is pointed out that the mother of the petitioners, who was also charge sheeted in the present case, has already expired during the pendency of the proceedings.

4. The present petition is filed on the ground that the matter is amicably settled between the parties, on their own free will, without any threat, coercion or pressure.

5. On 05.05.2025, Respondent No. 2 appeared before the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) and gave a voluntary statement that the dispute has been amicably settled.

6. The petitioners are present in Court today and Respondent No. 2 is present through video-conference. The parties and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. On being asked, Respondent No.2 submits that he does not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the present FIR and he has no objection if the same are quashed.

8. He submits that he has shifted to Mumbai and he is not in a position to travel to Delhi and states that the continuation of proceedings is only causing harassment. He further expressed his frustration with the prolonged trial.

9. Offences under Sections 448/506 of the IPC are compoundable.

10. This Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by relegating the parties to the learned Trial Court for filing an application to compound the offence.

11. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and that the complainant does not wish to pursue any proceedings, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the



dispute alive and continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of Court and further harassment to the complainant.

12. However, keeping in mind the fact that the matter is pending since the year 2003 and the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

13. In view of the above, FIR No. 904/2003 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of a total cost of ₹30,000/- by the petitioners, to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society, within a period of three months from date.

14. Let the proof of deposit of cost be submitted to the concerned SHO.

15. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JULY 2, 2025
“SS”