



2025:DHC:7581



§~48

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

%

Date of Decision: 01.09.2025

+

CRL.M.C. 6033/2025**HARMANDEEP SINGH & ORS.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ankur Sharma, Advocate with
petitioners no.1, 3 & 4

versus

THE STATE OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State with
SI Deepak Kumar, PS Govindpuri.
Respondent No.2 in person.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. Petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.147/2024 of PS Lajpat Nagar for offence under Section 288/338/34 IPC on the ground that complainant *de facto*/injured (respondent no.2) has compromised the disputes with the petitioners.

2. It appears that respondent no.2 was working as a daily wager in construction of a house owned by the present petitioners no.1-3. The respondent no.2 was engaged by the contractor petitioner no.4. While working, respondent no.2 fell from 4th floor and sustained injuries, so the subject FIR was registered. Since the settlement arrived at between the petitioners and respondent no.2 was completely silent about the compensation aspect, on last date I spoke with the parties present in court and they informed that the petitioners had paid Rs.75,000/- to respondent no.2, who had spent the entire amount on his medical treatment and food as



2025:DHC:7581



he could not work for about 02 months. After some discussion on last date, petitioners offered to pay further amount of Rs.75,000/- to respondent no.2.

3. Today, petitioners no.1,3 and 4 have appeared with respondent no.2, all of whom are identified by IO/SI Deepak Kumar. I have spoken with respondent no.2 in Hindi. It is stated by respondent no.2 that towards compensation for the injuries suffered by him, he was initially paid Rs.75,000/- and subsequent to last date, he was paid another amount of Rs.75,000/- by petitioners. The respondent no.2 further discloses that even on last date itself, another amount of Rs.10,000/- was paid to him by the petitioners. Respondent no.2 submits that he does not wish to pursue prosecution of petitioners.

4. Having spoken with respondent no.2, I am satisfied that it does not appear to be a case of exploitation of labour, so it would be in the interest of justice not to push the parties through trial.

5. Therefore, the petition is allowed and FIR No.147/2024 of PS Lajpat Nagar for offence under Section 288/338/34 IPC as well as proceedings arising out of the same are quashed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

SEPTEMBER 01, 2025/ry