



\$~85

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

%

*Date of Decision: 08.05.2026*

+ **CRL.M.C. 3611/2026 & CRL.M.A. 14636/2026**

INDRAPAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Amitava Poddar and Mr.  
Narender Singh, Advocates

versus

THE STATE AND ANOTHER

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the  
State with ASI Devender Kumar

**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA**

**J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. The petitioner seeks quashing of case FIR No. 555/2022 of Police Station Sunlight Colony for offence under Section 336/506 IPC and Section 25/27/54/59 of the Arms Act on the basis of settlement deed dated 04.06.2025 arrived at between the petitioner and respondent no. 2.

2. Learned APP for the State assisted by IO/ASI Devender Kumar accepts notice and strongly opposes the petition in view of seriousness of the offences alleged.



3. I have heard learned counsel for petitioner as well as learned APP for the State.

4. The impugned FIR was registered on the complaint of the present respondent no. 2 Gaurav Sharma, alleging that on 11.12.2022 at about 09:05pm, when he was going home and reached under the foot over bridge of Ashram, the builder Inder Chaudhary (*the petitioner*) pointed a revolver at him with the threat to kill, after which the petitioner fired in the air to terrorise the respondent no. 2 and at that time Ajay Mishra, friend of respondent no. 2 also was present. After that, the petitioner fled the spot. Further, it is stated in the FIR that the present petitioner is embroiled in the property dispute with father of the respondent no. 2 and that dispute is pending in the High Court.

5. On behalf of petitioner, it is contended by learned counsel that since no harm was caused to respondent no. 2 and since the petitioner and respondent no. 2 have compromised the disputes, it would be in the interest of justice to quash the impugned FIR.

6. On the other hand, learned APP strongly opposes the petition, contending that the offences under the Arms Act are not wrong between two individuals, so the FIR cannot be quashed. Besides, as per prosecution, it would not be correct to say that respondent no. 2 did not suffer any harm, because the respondent no. 2 got terrorised with the shot fired by petitioner in the air as alleged in the FIR.



7. In my considered view, apart from the fact that the offences under the Arms Act are not the wrong between two individuals, even the rest of the allegations, especially the allegation that the petitioner fired in the air, that too at a busy public place, in itself is a serious offence, for which inherent powers cannot be invoked merely because the two individuals entered into some agreement.

8. Allowing such petition would lead to encouragement for repeating such brazen acts of lawlessness at the hands of those holding gun. I am not satisfied that it would be in the interest of justice to quash the impugned FIR and the proceedings emanating from the same.

9. The present petition is not just devoid of merits but completely frivolous, so dismissed with cost of Rs.25,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with DHCLSC within one week. Accompanying applications stand disposed of.

10. Copy of this order be given to the IO/ASI Devender Kumar, who shall ensure the compliance regarding payment of cost and shall file report within two weeks.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA  
(JUDGE)**

**MAY 08, 2026**  
**'rs'**