



\$~23

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3215/2025 & CRL.M.A. 14177/2025**

HARMANPREET SINGH WALIA ALIAS RINKALPetitioner

Through: Mr. Shafiq Khan, Mr. Sudarshan Jha,
Mr. Vikasdeep Sharma and Ms. Tanya, Advs.
along with petitioner (through VC)

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Meenakshi Dahiya, APP for
State.

W/SI Arti Singh, PS Vikas Puri

SI Satinder Kumar

Respondent no.2 present (through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AJAY DIGPAUL

ORDER

10.10.2025

%

1. The instant petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (hereinafter “BNSS”) [earlier Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (hereinafter “CrPC”)] has been filed by the petitioner praying for quashing of FIR No.166/2018 registered at Police Station – Vikas Puri for the offences punishable under Sections 354A/506/509/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereinafter “IPC”) and all the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. The allegations arise out of the FIR are that the complainant/respondent no. 2 alleged that during a dispute over the vacating of a rented property, the petitioner, to whom the property was let out,



misbehaved with her and her father, used abusive language, physically assaulted her by slapping and pulling her hair, and threatened to have false cases filed against her family. The complainant stated that the petitioner continued to harass and intimidate her and her elderly parents even after the incident, creating fear for their safety. The alleged acts stemmed from a tenancy dispute and were said to involve both harassment and threats.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submitted that chargesheet has already been filed and the charges have been framed against the petitioner. It is submitted that the petitioner and respondent no.2 have now settled their disputes amicably and are now moving forward towards a peaceful and harmonious future. Learned counsel submits that an order dated 13.08.2024 passed by this Court is on record and has been annexed as Annexure – 4 wherein learned counsel for the respondent therein (complainant) stated that the matter (tenancy dispute) was amicably settled between the parties for a sum of ₹6,50,000/-. Further, affidavit of respondent no. 2 is also on record vide which she has stated that she has no objection to the present FIR being quashed.

4. It is prayed by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the parties that the instant FIR may be quashed on the basis of the settlement between the parties.

5. Heard. Issue notice.

6. Learned APP for the State, who appears on advance notice, accepts notice and submits that there is no opposition to the prayer made by the petitioner seeking quashing of the FIR in question in view of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

7. Heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the record.



8. The petitioner is virtually present before this Court and has been identified by his counsel and Investigating Officer, Police Station – Vikas Puri. Respondent no.2 is also virtually present in the Court and has been identified by the counsel and the Investigating Officer.

9. On a query made by this Court, respondent no.2 has categorically stated that she has entered into compromise on her own free will and without any pressure. It is also stated by her that the entire dispute has been amicably settled between the parties and she is now moving towards a peaceful future and she does not wish to pursue the matter any further.

10. Keeping in view the fact that the matter stands settled between the petitioner and respondent no.2 amicably without any pressure, no fruitful purpose would be served by keeping the matter pending, rather the same would create further acrimony between them. Affidavit of respondent no. 2 stating her no objection is also on record.

11. It is, thus, in the interest of justice to quash the afore-mentioned FIR and the proceedings emanating therefrom.

12. In the present case, since the State machinery has been put into motion and the police has concluded the investigation and has filed the charge-sheet and further the judicial time has also been wasted, it is deemed appropriate to impose cost on the petitioner. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the petitioner is directed to deposit a cost of ₹25,000/- with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee within a period of two weeks from today.

13. Hence, in light of the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court passed in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab* (2012) 10 SCC 303**, FIR No.166/2018 registered at Police Station – Vikas Puri, for offences the punishable under



Sections 354A/506/509/34 of the IPC, and consequent proceedings emanating therefrom, are quashed *qua* the present petitioner, subject to payment of cost of ₹25,000/-, which shall be deposited with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee within a period of two weeks from today. The receipt of payment of cost is to be deposited with and verified by the concerned IO.

14. The petition alongwith pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

AJAY DIGPAUL, J

OCTOBER 10, 2025/AS/ryp