



\$~67

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3939/2025 & CRL.M.A. 17221/2025**

VAIBHAV JAIN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Nitin Garg, Adv. with
the petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam,
APP for the State with SI
Krishan, PS Palam
Village.

Mr. Anant Rishabh Singh,
Adv. for R-2 with R-2 in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **22.09.2025**

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 660/2024 dated 12.11.2024, registered at Police Station Palam Village, for offences under Sections 117(2)/127(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS').

2. The FIR was registered on a complaint given by Respondent No. 2. It is alleged that on 10.11.2024 at around 09:50 PM when Respondent No. 2 was going towards his house and blew the horn of his motorcycle to give him way, the petitioner, who was walking ahead of Respondent No. 2's motorcycle, stopped and started abusing Respondent No. 2. It is alleged that thereafter the petitioner also hit on Respondent No.



2's right eye as a consequence of which he momentarily lost vision.

3. The present petition has been filed on the ground that the parties have amicably settled all their disputes by way of Compromise Deed dated 18.05.2025, of their own free will, without any threat, pressure, coercion or undue influence.

4. The parties are present in person in Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

5. On being asked, Respondent No. 2 states he has no remaining grievance against the petitioner. He submits that he does not wish to pursue any proceedings arising out of the present FIR and has no objection if the same are quashed.

6. Offences under Sections 117(2)/127(2) of the BNS are compoundable in nature.

7. In the present case, Respondent No. 2 has stated that he has settled all the disputes with the petitioner and does not wish to pursue any proceedings arising out of the present FIR.

8. This Court is of the opinion that in such circumstances, no useful purpose would be served by relegating the parties to the learned Trial Court for filing an application to compound the offences.

9. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, 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.

10. However, keeping in mind the fact that the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be



served if the petitioner is put to cost.

11. In view of the above, FIR No. 660/2024 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to the payment of a cost of ₹10,000/- by the petitioner to be deposited with the Delhi Police Martyrs' Fund within a period of eight weeks from date.

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

13. The present petition is allowed in aforesaid terms. Pending application(s) also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025 / 'KDK'