



2025:DHC:6972



\$~51

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

%

Date of Decision: 18.08.2025

+

CRL.M.C. 2555/2025 & CRL.M.A. 11440/2025**RAM LAKHAN & ORS.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kushagra Bansal, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with ASI D. Kumar and Inspector
Manoj Kumar.
Mr. Vaibhav Negi, Advocate for R-2.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. Petitioners seek quashing of case FIR No. 181/2019 of PS Shalimar Bagh for offence under Section 308/323/341/34 IPC on the ground that the complainant *de facto* (respondent no.2) has compromised the disputes with the petitioners.

2. Respondent No.2 present in court with his counsel and identified by Investigating Officer/ASI Dharendra Kumar accepts notice.

3. Learned APP accepts notice and strongly objects to this petition,



disclosing that the remaining four injured persons have not been impleaded; that in the incident, one child also suffered injuries; that before the trial court, the present respondent no.2 has already testified against the petitioners and his testimony stands concluded; and that injuries suffered by the victims were serious in the sense that two injured persons suffered grievous hurt on head while the remaining three suffered simple injuries on different parts of the body.

4. Learned counsel for petitioners submits that the child who suffered injuries in the incident is the daughter of respondent no.2, who has settled the dispute on behalf of her as well. It is further submitted that the remaining injured persons are also relatives of respondent no.2.

5. So far as the injured daughter of the respondent no.2 is concerned, it is submitted by both sides that she is presently aged about 08 years and was aged about 03 years at the time of incident. It is the child who suffered injury, that too a grievous head injury caused by the petitioners with brick. It is the child who suffered pain. I find no reason to allow her father to barter her pain by accepting money from her assailants. Similarly, the remaining injured persons also suffered individual injury and pain, and on their behalf also, the present respondent no.2 has no legal or moral authority to settle the dispute.

6. Considering the above circumstances, I am not satisfied that it would be in the interest of justice not to push the parties through trial. Rather,



2025:DHC:6972



allowing this petition would be a grave injustice to the girl child, who suffered head injury caused by brick blow.

7. Therefore, the petition is dismissed. Pending application stands disposed of.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 18, 2025/ry