



\$~57

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6570/2025 & CRL.M.A. Nos. 27683-84/2025
AMARJIT SINGHPetitioner

Through: Mr. Subhash Chugh, Mr.
Keshav Ahuja, Mr.
Utkarsh and Ms. Anshu
Raj, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHIRespondent
Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam,
APP for the State with SI
Rajesh Kumar, PS
Mukherjee Nagar.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
16.09.2025

%

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 387/2018 dated 15.07.2018, registered at police station Mukherjee Nagar, for the offences under Sections 288/304A of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') including the proceedings emanating therefrom. Chargesheet has been filed in the present case.
2. The FIR was registered pursuant to the death of a labourer, who was engaged for renovation work of the Gurudwara. The petitioner is stated to be the President of Gurudwara Shri Guru Singh Sabha.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner cannot be held responsible for the death of the labourer. He submits that the contractor was engaged for the purpose of carrying out the renovation and the victim was also



employed by the said contractor.

4. It is pertinent to note that the FIR was registered way back in the year 2018. The chargesheet was filed in the year 2021 and the cognizance was taken on 31.08.2021.

5. The petitioner has since appeared before the learned Trial Court and it is stated that the matter is at the stage of arguments on charge.

6. Undisputedly, all arguments as raised in the present petition can be raised before the learned Trial Court while arguing on charge. It is not the case of the petitioner that he had approached the High Court seeking quashing of the FIR at the very inception.

7. While this Court is empowered to quash criminal proceedings even after filing of chargesheet to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of law, it is well settled that ordinarily, this Court should be cautious to exercise inherent jurisdiction and interfere with the proceedings after chargesheet has been filed after thorough investigation [Ref. ***State of Odisha v. Pratima Mohanty and Others: (2022) 16 SCC 703***].

8. In view of the above, this Court does not consider it apposite to entertain the present petition at this stage after seven years of registration of FIR, especially when the learned Trial Court is seized of the matter and is hearing the arguments on charge.

9. The present petition is dismissed with the liberty to the petitioner to raise all arguments and issues before the learned Trial Court while addressing arguments on charge. Pending application also stands disposed of.

10. Needless to state that the petitioner is at liberty to



approach this Court in case any grievance remains in future.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

DV