



\$~35

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1992/2024**

DEVANAND KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Manoj Godara, Advocate *via*
video-conferencing.
Petitioner in-person.

versus

STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel for
State.
SI Pramod Kumar, P.S.: Kapashera.
R-2 *via* video-conferencing.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

20.01.2026

%

By way of the present petition filed under Articles 226/227 of the Constitution of India read with section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure 1973, the petitioner seeks quashing of case FIR No. 400/2014 dated 28.08.2014 registered under sections 120B/34/406/420/506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Kapshera, South-West Delhi. Consequent upon completion of investigation, allegation of an offence under section 174-A IPC was also added *vide* chargesheet dated 23.12.2026.

2. At the outset, it is submitted that section 174-A IPC was alleged only in relation to co-accused Harmeeek Singh @ Herry, who has since passed-away; and consequently, proceedings against Harmeeek Singh



stand abated *vide* order dated 11.05.2023 passed by the learned MM(10), Dwarka Courts, New Delhi in 1 Cr. Case 2108/2017.

3. The petition is premised on a Settlement dated 25.05.2023 arrived at before the Mediation Centre, Dwarka Courts, New Delhi, whereby the petitioner and respondent No. 2 have resolved the matter amicably.
4. The petition is also supported by affidavits of the petitioner and of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
5. Learned counsel appearing for petitioner No.1 has joined the proceedings *via* video-conferencing. Petitioner No.1 is present in person. Respondent No.2 has also joined the proceedings *via* video-conferencing. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by counsel.
6. The court has interacted with respondent No.2, as also with the petitioner, who have confirmed that they have now resolved the matter and a settlement has been signed by them closing all issues amicably. Parties now wish to live in peace and harmony going forward.
7. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
8. 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.

9. Accordingly, case FIR No. 400/2014 dated 28.08.2014 registered under sections 120B/34/406/420/506 of IPC at P.S.: Kapshera, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
10. Petition stands disposed-of.
11. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JANUARY 20, 2026/ak