



\$~62

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7679/2025 & CRL.M.A. 32110/2025**

UDAY SHARMA ALIYAS UDDESHYA AND ANR.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Harsh Sharma, Advocate along
with petitioners in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for the State for
State along with SI Rekha Chauhan.
Mohd. Adil, Advocate for R-2 & 3
and R-2 & 3 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

31.10.2025

%

CRL.M.A. 32110/2025(condonation of delay)

1. By way of the present application, the applicants are seeking condonation of delay of 92 days in filing of the present petition.
2. For the reasons mentioned in the application, the present application is allowed and the delay of 92 days in filing the present petition stands condoned.
3. Accordingly, the present application is disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 7679/2025

4. By way of the present petition, the petitioners seek quashing of the FIR bearing No. 286/2017, registered at Police Station Mehrauli, New Delhi, for the commission of offences punishable under Sections 324/341/34



of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (hereafter '*IPC*').

5. Issue notice. The learned APP accepts notice on behalf of the State.

6. All the petitioners, complainant/respondent no. 2 and injured person are present before this Court and have been identified by their counsel and Investigating Officer (IO) concerned, Police Station, Mehrauli, Delhi.

7. Brief facts of the case are that on 09.05.2017, at about 6:40 PM., the respondent no. 2 had left his home in his auto-rickshaw for work. When he reached near SBI Bank, in front of Sridhar Apartments, his auto allegedly came into contact with a car. Subsequently, three persons, already known to the complainant, were present in the car — namely Uday Sharma, Karan Chhabra, and Jatin. It is alleged that these persons, including the petitioners, started abusing the complainant. The situation was temporarily diffused, and the parties were separated. However, while the complainant was leaving the spot, the present petitioners allegedly approached him from behind and caught hold of him. Petitioner no. 2 is stated to have attacked the complainant with a sharp object, causing injuries to his head and body. Upon noticing the bleeding, the petitioners fled from the scene. Thereafter, a call was made to the police helpline, and a PCR van arrived and had took the complainant/respondent No. 2 to AIIMS Trauma Centre. Accordingly, his statement was recorded there, on the basis of which the present FIR was registered. It is stated that with intervention of the family and friends and respected members of the society, the parties have now amicably settled their dispute *vide* Compromise Deed dated 07.08.2024.

8. The learned APP for State on instructions from the IO submits that one of the co-accused persons i.e., Karan Chhabra has not been declared as an absconder nor any process has been initiated against him and the IO



concerned has no explanation as to why no efforts were made to arrest the co-accused/Karan Chabra. However, that issue falls within the jurisdiction of the learned Trial Court be that as it may, the parties concerned, the complainants/injured persons and the accused persons who are present before this Court have compromise the present matter *vide* Compromise Deed dated 07.08.2024.

9. It is not disputed that the charges were framed under Section 324 of IPC, which has not been challenged by the State. Though, it is stated that the injury was at the part of the body.

10. On a query made by this Court, complainant/respondent no. 2 and injured person who have been identified by the IO, have categorically stated that they have entered into compromise out of their own free will and without any pressure, coercion or threat. Therefore, they have no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

11. In view of the above, that the parties have amicably resolved their differences of their own free will, and without any coercion, no useful purpose will be served by continuing the proceedings, rather the same would create further acrimony between them. It would thus be in interest of justice to quash the abovementioned FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto. There is no legal impediment in quashing the FIR in question.

12. Considering the overall facts and circumstances of the present case and the fact that the matter has amicably been settled between the parties, the FIR bearing No. 286/2017, registered at Police Station Mehrauli, New Delhi, for the commission offences punishable under Sections 324/341/34 of IPC and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed partially to the extent of the petitioners who are present before this Court,



subject to the petitioners depositing a sum of ₹ 5,000/- each with the Delhi High Court Bar Association Advocates' Welfare Fund, within a period of 07 days from date.

13. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.

14. However, it is clarified that the State will be at liberty to take appropriate steps for arrest of the co-accused/Karan Chabra.

15. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

OCTOBER 31, 2025/vc