



\$~72

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 395/2026
AJAY PORUS AND ANRPetitioners
Through: Counsel (appearance not given).
Petitioners in-person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for the State.
SI Anita, PS- Tilak Marg.
Mr. N.K. Chauhan, Advocate for R-2
via video-conferencing.
Respondent No.2 in-person via video-
conferencing.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

% **16.01.2026**

CRL.M.A. 1477/2026 (exemption)

Exemption granted, subject to just exceptions.

Let requisite compliances be made within 01 week.

The application stands disposed-of.

CRL.M.A. 1478/2026 (condonation of 11 days' delay in re-filing)

By way of the present application filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023 ('BNSS'), the applicants/petitioners seek condonation of about 11 days' delay in *re-filing* the present petition.

2. For the reasons stated in the application, which is duly supported by affidavit, the delay is condoned.
3. The application is allowed and disposed-of.



CRL.M.C. 395/2026

4. By way of the present petition filed under section 528 BNSS, the petitioners seek quashing of case FIR No. 0008/2015 dated 06.01.2015 registered under sections 120B/420/467/468/471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') at P.S.: Tilak Marg, New Delhi.
5. The petition is premised on Mutual Settlement Agreement dated 29.09.2025, whereby the petitioners and respondent No. 2 have resolved the matter amicably.
6. The petition is also supported by affidavits of the petitioners and of respondent No. 2, alongwith proof of their IDs.
7. The petitioners are present in court; and respondent No.2, has joined the proceedings *via* video-conferencing from Australia. Their credentials have been verified and they have also been identified by their respective counsel.
8. One of the elements of the settlement entered into between the parties is that upon conclusion of the claim proceedings pending before the learned Motor Accidents Claims Tribunal, respondent No.2 would be entitled to receive 60% of the compensation awarded and petitioner No. 1 would be entitled to receive 40% of that compensation. This is recorded in clause 2.1 of the settlement agreement.
9. The court has interacted with respondent No.2, as also with the petitioners, who have confirmed that they have now resolved the matter and a Mutual Settlement Agreement dated 29.09.2025 has been signed by them closing all issues amicably. Parties now wish to live in peace and harmony going forward.



10. Mr. Shoaib Haider, learned APP 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. Accordingly, case FIR No. 0008/2015 dated 06.01.2015 registered under sections 120B/420/467/468/471 IPC at P.S.: Tilak Marg, New Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
13. All the parties shall remain bound by the terms of Mutual Settlement Agreement dated 29.09.2025.
14. Petition stands disposed-of.
15. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

JANUARY 16, 2026

V.Rawat