



\$~51

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2201/2025 & CRL.M.A. 7091/2025

JITENDER RANA @ JEETU & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Omkar Sharma, Adv. with all the
petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with ASI Dharmender Rai (IO), P.S. Nihar Vihar.
Complainant is present in person with respondent
no. 3.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

23.09.2025

%

1. The petitioners herein seek compromise quashing of an FIR No. 657/2024 dated 29.05.2024 for the alleged offenses under Sections 307/365/324/34 IPC lodged at Police Station Nihar Vihar, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.

2. Per FIR, complainant alleged that his brother was forcibly taken to petitioners' house, where they attacked him with a knife. It is further alleged that the complainant was also injured while intervening. The parties are known to each other and residing in the same locality.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties have amicably settled the dispute *vide* settlement deed without force, coercion, or undue influence dated 07.03.2025 which is placed on record (Annexure P-2). He further submits that an affidavit of no objection to the quashing, deposited by respondent no. 2, has also been placed on record.

3.1 He also submits that the parties undertake to maintain peace and harmony among themselves and live peacefully in the future. Continuation of the FIR would unnecessarily create tensions and strain their relationship, defeating the purpose of the settlement. Reliance has been on ***Nikhil Merchant vs. CBI & Anr., (2008) 9 SCC 677***. He further submits that pursuing the FIR and related proceedings would serve no useful purpose, amount to an abuse of the process of law.

3.2 Furthermore, he submits that Petitioners No. 1 and 3 are young individuals and sole breadwinners of their families, while Petitioner No. 2 is a minor. All have clean antecedents, and continuation of the case would cause them undue hardship.

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 and convey their no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsels for the parties, as well as perused the material available on record.

6. The parties are present in Court, and I have interacted with them. *Qua* invoking Section 307 of the IPC and considering the alleged grievous injury suffered by the victim, on a Court query, the complainant candidly admits that on the fateful day, he was high under intoxication. He does not



remember as to how he suffered injury, whether it was caused due to his own fall on being hit with a sharp edged article or due to an accident or it was caused due to assault by the applicants who are his friends and who were also equally in inebriated state as he was. He also submits that since the applicants are his friends, he does not want to pursue the case against the petitioners. Rather, he wants peace and enjoy the mutual bonhomie in posterity.

7. Given that the dispute has been resolved, continuing with criminal proceedings may serve no useful purpose. It would be a drain on judicial resources and abuse of the process of law, especially when dispute does not involve any public interest or interest of the society at large. Continuation of the proceedings, on the other hand, may result in hostility between the parties and defeat the very purpose of the settlement.

8. Even on a plain reading, and in light of the candid statements of parties, it appears doubtful whether the essential ingredients of the offences invoked under the penal provisions are satisfied. In any case, even complainant does not wish to press any charges against the petitioner with whom he has cordial relationships for long. All of them are friends and having amicably settled the matter and they wish to live in peace.

9. Quashing the FIR would rather facilitate the parties in maintaining or restoring cordiality. Therefore, the proceedings deserve to be quashed in the exercise of the inherent powers of the Court. Reference may be had to the judgement rendered in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]*** in this context.

10. Accordingly, exercising the inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of BNSS, it is therefore deemed appropriate to quash the



FIR arising from this private dispute.

11. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.657/2024 dated 29.05.2024 under Sections 307/365/324/34 IPC lodged at Police Station Nihal Vihar and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

12. The pending application also stands dispose of.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 23, 2025

acm