



\$~35

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

+ CRL.M.C. 4175/2025

RAVI @ RAVINATH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pradeep Rana, Mr. Gagan Bhatnagar and Mr. Deepak Chhillar, Advocates with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State with SI Ramvatar, PS – Vasant Vihar. Mr. Tushar Rohmetra, Advocate for respondent no. 2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

%

18.08.2025

1. Quashing of an FIR No.91/2024 dated 12.05.2024 lodged at Police Station Vasant Vihar, District South West (Delhi), and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom for offence under Section 307 of IPC, is sought herein on the basis of compromise, arrived between the parties.
2. Gulab Singh (Respondent no. 2), was allegedly attacked by his neighbor, Ravi (Petitioner), who was under the influence of alcohol. Based on the statement FIR was registered.
3. In the aforesaid backdrop, having heard the parties and perused the material on record.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that in view of the compromise between the parties as is borne out from the compromise-deed dated 04.05.2025, respondent No.2- complainant is not inclined to press charges against the petitioners and proceed further in the matter.



5. Learned counsel places reliance on a decision of Supreme Court in the case of ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***. He urges that the impugned FIR and all consequential proceedings may be quashed on the basis of compromise.
6. Learned counsel for the respondent No.2-complainant and learned Public Prosecutor concur with the fact of compromise and submit that in view of the compromise, they have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.
7. *Qua* invoking Section 307 of the IPC and considering the alleged grievous injury suffered by the victim, on a Court query, both the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned counsel for the complainant submitted that, although allegations of grievous injury were made by the victim at the time of registration of the FIR, but the same were in heat of the moment. Subsequently, after receiving treatment, it turned out that the injury was simple in nature, and the complainant does not wish to press any charges against the accused.
8. Having perused the MLC as well as nature of injury, it appears injury was not only minor but even otherwise the allegation of stabbing with knife seems to be arising out of heated tampers at the time of incident when both petitioner as well as accused indulged in free fight with each other resulting in mutual assault. The MLC report also does not state as to whether it was actually stabbing caused by the knife, as the words used therein are “*sharp instrument in the shape of knife*”. Furthermore, the complainant, who appears through video conferencing states injury was minor.
9. On a query put to his counsel, he submits that the complainant had also conveyed his no objection to the I.O. who is present in Court and



confirms the same. That apart, affidavit of respondent no. 2/ complainant has also been appended with the petition.

10. Learned counsel representing respondent no. 2 would submit that the complainant had candidly disclosed to him that at the time of registration of the FIR though words stabbing were used actually there was no knife and the injury was caused due to a fall resulted by the physically assault and having hit some sharp-edged instrument and thus, the erroneous invocation of Section 307 of IPC.

11. Having given my thought to the totality of circumstance, I am of the view that ingredients of Section 307 of IPC are not made out. In any case, even complainant does not wish to press any charges against the petitioner with whom he has cordial relationships for decades. Both of them are neighbours and having amicably settled the matter and they wish to live in peace and enjoy the mutual bonhomie in posterity.

12. In the premise, applying the ratio in decision of Gian Singh (Supra), I deem it just and proper to invoke inherent powers of this Court under Section 528 of BNSS to avoid undue hardship to the parties for mutual good relations and societal peace.

13. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.91/2024 dated 12.05.2024 lodged at Police Station Vasant Vihar, District South West (Delhi) and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom for offence under Section 307 of the IPC, against the petitioners are hereby quashed.

ARUN MONGA, J

AUGUST 18, 2025/kd