



\$~14

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

+ CRL.M.C. 4999/2025 & CRL.M.A. 21679/2025

VIKAS KUMAR YOGI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishikesh Kumar, Ms. Sheenu Priya, Ms. Roshini Haldar and Mr. Sachin Kumar, Advocates along with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP for the State with SI Rahul Dhama, PS IP Estate. Mr. Himanshu Sethi, Advocate for R-2 & R-3 along with R-2 and R-3 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

03.09.2025

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 168/2024 dated 21.05.2024, registered at Police Station I.P.Estate, for offences under Sections 323/ 341/ 506/ 509/ 427/ 149/ 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'), including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. The FIR was registered on a complaint made by Respondent No.2.

2. It is averred that Respondent No.2 is working as a senior reporter with a leading News Channel and the petitioner is the media coordinator of a political party– Aam Admi Party ('AAP'). Allegedly, on 20.05.2024, at around 4:45 P.M., when Respondent No. 2 reached the office of AAP to cover a story in relation to the foreign funding received by them, the petitioner rushed towards Respondents No. 2 and started arguing with her in an intimidating tone. At the instance of the petitioner, 8 to 10



party workers allegedly tried to snatch the camera to turn it off and surrounded Respondent No.2 and the cameraperson. It is alleged that the party workers also raised slogans in derogatory terms and pushed Respondent No.2 and the cameraperson towards the gate of the premises. This led to registration of FIR.

3. It is pointed out that pursuant to the altercation, an application was filed under Section 156(3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('CrPC') for registration of FIR against Respondent No.2 by Respondent No.3 (a caretaker of AAP) as well. It is stated that the altercation took place in the heat of the moment and Respondent No.3 has also taken steps to withdraw the case instituted by him as the matter has been amicably settled between the parties.

4. The present petition is filed on the ground that the parties have settled their disputes by way of Settlement Deed dated 02.06.2025, out of their free will without any pressure, coercion or undue influence.

5. The petitioner and Respondents Nos. 2 and 3 are present in person and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

6. The petitioner states that he has unconditionally apologized for his behaviour. He also undertakes not to indulge into any such activity in future.

7. On being asked, Respondent No.2 states that she has no remaining grievance against the petitioner and she is satisfied with the apology. She states that she does not wish to pursue any proceedings arising out of the present FIR and has no objection if the same is quashed in its entirety.

8. Offences under Sections 323/341/506/509/427 of the IPC are compoundable.

9. Section 320 (3) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973



provides that when the substantive underlying offence is compoundable and the accused is liable under Sections 34 or 149 of the IPC, the same may be compounded in like manner.

10. This Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by relegating the parties to the learned Trial Court for filing an application to compound the offences.

11. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the dispute alive and continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of Court.

12. However, keeping in mind the fact that the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioner is put to cost.

13. In view of the above, FIR No. 168/2024 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of total cost of ₹25,000/- by petitioner to be deposited with the Delhi Police Martyrs' Fund, within a period of eight weeks from date.

14. Let the proof of deposit of cost be submitted to the concerned SHO.

15. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

SEPTEMBER 3, 2025/DU