



2025:DHC:7146



\$~57

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 21.08.2025

+

CRL.M.C. 5761/2025 & CRL.M.A. 24680/2025

NITIN HOODA

.....Petitioner

Through: Counsel for petitioner (*appearance not given*)

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State with
SI Kishan Chand, PS Dwarka South**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of case FIR No. 358/2024 of PS Dwarka South for offence under Section 109(1) BNS read with Section 27 Arms Act on the ground that the complainant *de facto* (*respondent no.2*) has compromised the disputes with the petitioner.

2. At the outset, learned APP points out that earlier the petitioner filed a similar petition for quashing the same FIR and the said petition bearing no. CRL.M.C. 9429/2024 was dismissed as unconditionally withdrawn vide order dated 02.12.2024 of a coordinate bench. That being so, according to learned APP the present petition is not even maintainable.

CRL.M.C.5761/2025

Page 1 of 2 pages

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: NEETU N NAIR
Signing Date: 21.08.2025
18:42:15GIRISH
KATHPALIADigitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, email=GIRISH.KATHPALIA@JUDGECLOUD.GOV.IN, postalCode=110003, st=Delhi, serialNumber=D36A796451E45C07B5D1557099B408BC42E06002C487965F801A25FA, c=IN
Date: 2025.08.21 18:39:07 +07'00'



2025:DHC:7146



3. Broadly speaking, the allegation against the petitioner is that he pointed his pistol at respondent no.2, who at that time was accompanied with his children; and the petitioner challenged to kill respondent no.2, after which he pulled the trigger, firing a bullet which missed the target because the person accompanying the petitioner held hand of the petitioner. Had the bullet not misfired, the consequences would have been fatal. Had the bullet hit the child, consequences would have been far worse.

4. Considering the circumstances narrated above, I am not satisfied that it is in the interest of justice to quash the proceedings. Rather, even after unconditional withdrawal of the earlier petition, this petition has been filed afresh and is a total waste of judicial time.

5. Therefore, the petition is dismissed with cost of Rs.25,000/- to be deposited by petitioner with DHCLSC within one week. Copy of this order be sent to the trial court to ensure deposit of cost by the petitioner. Pending application stands disposed of.

**GIRISH
KATHPALIA**

Digitally signed by GIRISH KATHPALIA
DN: c=IN, o=HIGH COURT OF DELHI,
2.5.4.20=8401dd889b27a77b2f65ffffe4a
fec45569af3962c6fb4835d435f97626ca
cca, ou=HIGH COURT OF DELHI, CID -
7047638, postalCode=110003, st=Delhi,
serialNumber=d3e86796451ec45c07b5
d15570996b40f80cbd2eee60402c4879
65ff801e26fa, cn=GIRISH KATHPALIA
Date: 2025.08.21 18:38:50 -07'00'

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 21, 2025/ry

CRL.M.C.5761/2025

Page 2 of 2 pages

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: NEETU N NAIR
Signing Date: 21.08.2025
18:42:15