



\$~62

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: 10th February, 2026*

+ CRL.M.C. 1134/2026 & CRL.M.A. 4471/2026

ANIL KUMAR AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. R.V. Singh, Advocate with
petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for the
State with ASI Pradeep Kumar, PS
Hauz Khas.
Mr. Z.A. Ansari, Advocate for
respondent No.2 with respondent No.2
in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of FIR No. 320/2022 dated 09.08.2022, registered at P.S. Tigri, for commission of offences under Sections 324/323/341/34 IPC along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. Charge-sheet has already been filed for commission of offences under Section 323/324/341/201/34 IPC. Charges are yet to be framed.
3. In the abovesaid FIR, there are three accused persons i.e. Mr. Anil Kumar, Mr. Manoj Solanki and Mr. Shivbir @ Ramu.
4. In the present petition, only one injured has been made party, whereas, as per the averments appearing in charge-sheet, the injuries were received by



three persons i.e. Mr. Deepak Kumar (respondent no. 2), Mr. Ajay and Ms. Sangeeta (wife of Ajay).

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was some dispute between the neighbours and, with respect to the incident in question, a cross-FIR No.325/2022 at PS Tigri for commission of offences under Sections 323/341/34 IPC was also registered. In the cross-case, the injured was Mr. Anil Kumar and the accused are Mr. Deepak, Mr. Ajay, Ms. Sangeeta and Mr. Sunil.

6. Both the abovesaid cases were referred for mediation by the concerned Magisterial Court and, fortunately, both the sides were able to settle all their disputes. The settlement has taken place under the *aegis of Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi* on 19.12.2024 and, as per the terms of settlement, the respective complainants in both the aforesaid matters have agreed to compound the matter and they have also assured that they would give requisite assistance for the purposes of quashing of the FIR, in case the offences were non-compoundable.

7. The aforesaid *Memorandum of Understanding* (MoU) is signed by all three injured in the present matter i.e. Mr. Deepak Kumar, Mr. Ajay and his wife Sangeeta.

8. It is apprised that, in view of the aforesaid settlement, the cross-case has already been compounded. I have seen order dated 11.08.2025, passed by learned JMFC-04, South, Saket, whereby on the basis of the statement of the complainant, the permission to compound the offences has been granted and all the accused in the cross-FIR have already been acquitted.

9. The terms of MoU/settlement have been reiterated by all the three injured persons.



10. Respondent No.2 - Deepak Kumar and other two injured i.e. Mr. Ajay and Ms. Sangeeta are present in person and have been identified by his counsel, as well as Investigating Officer, who is present in Court. They also reiterate the terms of settlement and have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

11. Though, ideally, Mr. Ajay and Ms. Sangeeta, should have also been made respondents in the present matter, keeping in mind the overall facts, and also appreciating the fact that the matter with respect to cross-FIR has already been compounded, and in view of the statements made by all the three injured persons today, continuing with criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose, especially, when dispute does not involve any public interest and is, primarily, private in nature. In any case, even the complainant does not wish to press any charges against the petitioners.

12. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

13. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No. 320/2022 dated 09.08.2022, registered at P.S. Tigri, for commission of offences under Sections 324/323/341/34 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby, quashed.

14. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 10, 2026/st/pb