



\$~8

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4139/2025**

WASIM AHMED @ RIHAN KHANPetitioner

Through: Mr. Saif Ali, Adv. along with
petitioner in person through VC.

versus

THE STATE GNCTD & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State.
Mr. Umashankar Panda, Adv. For
R-2. along with R-2 in person through
VC.
SI Suresh Chand, PS Connaught
Place.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

% **01.07.2025**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.

CRL.M.A. 18120/2025 (exemption)

2. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions. The application is disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 4139/2025

3. The present petition under section 528 of the BNSS has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 170/2014, under Sections 354A/354D of the IPC and Section 66A and 67 of the IT Act, 2000, registered as P.S. Connaught Place and all the other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Kavita Bhist, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the latter has since



compromised with respondent no. 2. Therefore, the present petition seeking quashing of the aforesaid FIR along with all the other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom has been preferred.

5. Petitioner and respondent no. 2 are present before the Court through video conferencing and have been duly identified by their respective counsels, as well as the Investigating Officer, SI Suresh Chand, PS Connaught Place.

6. The Complainant/respondent No.2 states that the matter has been settled with the petitioner and she has no objection if the FIR is quashed against the petitioner.

7. Learned APP for the State submits that investigation in the present FIR has been completed and the chargesheet has been filed is pending before the court of competent jurisdiction.

8. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

“61. ... In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

9. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and that fact that the parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 170/2014, under Sections 354A/354D of the IPC and Section 66A and 67 of the IT Act, 2000, registered as P.S.



Connaught Place and all the other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Kavita Bhist, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi.

10. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 170/2014, under Sections 354A/354D of the IPC and Section 66A and 67 of the IT Act, 2000, registered as P.S. Connaught Place and all the other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Kavita Bhist, learned Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi, is hereby quashed subject to cost of Rs. 15,000 to be deposited by the petitioner with DHCBA Employees Welfare Fund (S.B. A/C no. 15530100010657, IFSC- UCBA0001553) within 10 days.

11. Petition is disposed of.

12. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

JULY 1, 2025/kr

Click here to check corrigendum, if any