



\$~75

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 518/2026 & CRL.M.A. 2084/2026**
VIVIEK BAISOYA @ VIVEK CHAUDHARY & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Nidhi Lakra, Mr. Puneet Basist
and Ms. Kirti Tanwar, Advocates.
All petitioners in-person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the
State.
SI Harsh, P.S.: Seelampur.
Ms. Komal, Advocate for R-2 with
R-2 in-person *via* video-conferencing.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

21.01.2026

%

By way of the present petition filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioners seek quashing of case FIR No. 0513/2024 dated 14.12.2024 registered under sections 110/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita 2023, ('BNS') at P.S.: Seelampur, North-East Delhi.

2. The petition is premised on a Compromise Deed dated 03.12.2025, whereby the petitioners and respondent No. 2 have resolved the matter amicably.
3. The petition is also supported by affidavits of the petitioners and of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
4. The petitioners are present in court and respondent No. 2 has joined *via* video-conferencing. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by their respective counsel.



5. The court has perused the MLC, a copy of which is appended to the petition. The MLC shows that respondent No.2 had sustained a lacerated wound of 3 cm x 0.5 cm x 1 cm over his left parietal region.
6. Respondent No.2 is present *via* video-conferencing; and upon being queried, he states that he was admitted in a hospital for 3-4 days.
7. Though learned ASC appearing for respondent No.1 submits, that medical opinion as to whether the injury was 'simple' or 'grievous' is awaited, this court is unable to understand as to what opinion would now be rendered by the doctors in relation to an injury that was documented *vide* MLC dated 13.12.2024.
8. However, respondent No. 2 submits, that he has completely recovered now; and has suffered no permanent disability by reason of the injury inflicted by the petitioners.
9. The incident is stated to have arisen by reason of heated arguments among the parties, who are all college students.
10. Learned ASC confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
11. In the circumstances, in line with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2012) 10 SCC 303 as also in ***Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2014) 6 SCC 466, this court sees no reason why the subject FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom should not be quashed. This court is of the view that in light of the settlement between the contesting parties, continuing with the subject FIR and all subsequent proceedings would be an exercise in futility and would not be conducive to peace and harmony between the parties.



12. While allowing the petition however, this court considers it appropriate, that by way of atonement, the petitioners shall pay costs of Rs.10,000/- *each* to Friendicoes SECA, No.271 & 273, Defence Colony Flyover Market, Jungpura, New Delhi within 04 weeks.
13. Subject to the aforesaid condition, case FIR No. 0513/2024 dated 14.12.2024 registered under sections 110/3(5) of the BNS at P.S.: Seelampur, North-East Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
14. Petitioners are directed to place on record the proof of payment of costs within 01 week of payment of costs.
15. The Registry is directed to re-list the matter if costs are not paid as directed.
16. The petition stands disposed-of.
17. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JANUARY 21, 2026

V.Rawat