



\$~95

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: 21st May, 2026*

+ W.P.(CRL) 3446/2023, CRL.M.A. 31938/2023, CRL.M.A.
31939/2023 & CRL.M.A. 18625/2025

KARTIK YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rizwan, Ms. Sachi Chopra and
Ms. Jessica Khera, Advocates

versus

STATE & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, Addl. Standing
Counsel (Crl.) with Mr. Sangeet
Sibou, Advocate for State/R-1
Mr. Piyush Beriwal, Advocate for
R-3
SI Ritika Dhiwan (P.S. Chanakya
Puri)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No. 248/2023 dated 17.11.2023 registered at Police Station Chanakya Puri for commission of offence under Section 279 IPC along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. It's a case of rash or negligent driving alone. None received injuries.
2. Mr. Piyush Beriwal, learned counsel for respondent No. 3 undertakes to file his *vakalatnama* during course of the day.
3. Mr. Beriwal submits that it was the car of respondent No. 3 which met with an accident, caused by petitioner herein. He submits that car of the



respondent No. 3, at the relevant time, was being driven by his driver Raj Kumar (complainant/respondent No.2) and, when accident had taken place, their such car was stationary. He submits that such driver has, unfortunately, expired in the interregnum. He submits that, as per instructions received from respondent No. 3, he is no longer desirous in pursuing with the aforesaid FIR and would have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed, *albeit*, for the above reason. He submits that the offence stands revealed and the assertions made in the petition were, totally, unwarranted.

4. Learned counsel for respondent No. 3 also submits that an apology was also tendered by the petitioner herein and, keeping in mind the overall facts, and also the unfortunate death of the driver, apology is accepted and, therefore, respondent No. 3 would have '*no objection*' if the FIR in question is quashed. He also states that the respondent No. 3 is not seeking any compensation with respect to the damage caused to his car.

5. Petitioner is, reportedly, in his thirties and has no previous involvement.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner submits that as per instructions, petitioner is not pressing the assertions made by him in context of respondent No. 3 and since his apology has been accepted, he prays for quashing of FIR.

7. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case, age of petitioner, his previous clean antecedents and the fact that his apology has been duly accepted by respondent No. 3 and that none received any injuries in the accident in question, no useful purpose would be served in continuing with the criminal proceedings emanating from the FIR in question.

8. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under



Section 528 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*, it is deemed appropriate to quash both the FIR.

9. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No. 248/2023 dated 17.11.2023, registered at Police Station Chanakya Puri for commission of offence under Section 279 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is quashed subject to petitioner's depositing a total cost of Rs. 1,000/- with *Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee (DHCLSC)* within ten days from today.

10. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

11. Pending applications also stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MAY 21, 2026/dr/pb