



\$~48 & 49

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3801/2025

HARISH RAWAT

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Arun Tyagi, Adv.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State

Mr. Suraj Pal Singh, Adv. for R-2.

+ CRL.M.C. 3837/2025

SUSIL KUMAR & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Suraj Pal Singh, Adv. with all the
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State

Mr. Arun Tyagi, Adv. for R-2 & R-3

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

16.09.2025

%

1. Vide this common order, above titled two petitions seeking quashing of cross FIRs registered for the same event are being disposed of. First, FIR No. 54/2019 dated 03.06.2019 registered under Sections 354/354(A)/509 of IPC and the second FIR bearing no. 40/2019 dated 09.04.2019 registered



under Sections 307/34 of IPC both lodged at Police Station – Parliament Street and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom are sought to be quashed on the basis of a compromise arrived between the parties.

2. Both FIRs, *ibid*, arising out of the same incident on the same date, represent a version and counter-version of the dispute. A heated altercation degenerated into an unsavoury scuffle between the parties with each side alleging assault, intimidation, and misbehaviour against the other.

3. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard the counsels and interacted with the respective parties who are present in Court.

4. Learned counsels appearing for the respective petitioners in both petitions submit that there was a serious misunderstanding on the part of their clients that led to lodging of FIR and cross FIR, as above. The parties have now amicably settled the matter vide Compromise agreement dated 19.05.2025, placed on record (**Annexure P-3 in CrI. M.C. 3801/2025 and as Annexure P-2 in CrI. M.C. 3837/2025**) and hence the petitioners are seeking quashing of the aforesaid two FIRs.

5. The learned APP for the State and counsel for respondents in both the petitions concur with the factum of compromise arrived at between the parties and convey their no objection to the quashing of the FIRs.

6. I have interacted with the parties who are present in person and on a pointed question put to them as to why they lodged the FIRs against each other and misused the criminal machinery unnecessarily, they show remorse and say that they are highly regretful and would not repeat such behaviour in future. They further state that they did not realize the adverse consequences of making such allegations and, in any case, were not aware as to what sections would be invoked by the police officials. They jointly submit that



given that they have buried the hatchet and in order to not unnecessarily nurture any hostilities in future. They wish to enjoy the mutual cordiality and bonhomie arising out of the settlement. They submit that FIR be quashed as they do not intent to press any charges against each other.

7. It appears that the underlying dispute, being private in nature, has indeed been amicably resolved. The parties affirm in unison, of their own free will and without any coercion or duress that they do not wish to pursue the matter and consent to the quashing of the FIRs in question.

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.

9. *Qua* invoking Section 307 of IPC in FIR No. 40/2019 and considering the alleged grievous injury suffered by the victim, on a Court query, the complainants, who are present in Court, candidly admits that the incident got escalated due to the heated tempers of the parties and no such injury actually was sustained in the cross-scuffle.

10. Having given my thought to the totality of circumstance, it appears doubtful if ingredients of Section 307 of IPC are made out. In any case, even complainants do not wish to press any charges against the petitioner and wish to live in peace and enjoy the mutual bonhomie in posterity.

11. At this stage, in light thereof, I am of the view that both the petitions deserve to be allowed on that count as well.

12. Be that as it may, 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.

13. Quashing the FIRs 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.

14. 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.

15. In light of the above, I am of the view both petitions deserve to be allowed.

16. Accordingly, the petitions are allowed. FIR No. 54/2019 dated 03.06.2019 registered under Sections 354/354(A)/509 IPC and FIR bearing no. 40/2019 dated 09.04.2019 registered under Sections 307/34 IPC both lodged at Police Station – Parliament Street and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

17. The petitions stand disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

acm