



\$~68

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 4241/2025**

PRADEEP SHARMA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Rahul Malhotra, Mr. Chirag Goyal and Ms. Sneha Agarwal, Advs. along with petitioner no.1 and AR of petitioner no.2.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel with Mr. Abhinav Arya and Mr. Aryan Sachdeva, Advs. with SI Reena, P.S. Dwarka North.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

22.12.2025

CRL.M.A. 38137/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 4241/2025

3. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR No.0327/2024 under Sections 290/125(a)/106 BNS, 2023 registered at Police Station Dwarka North and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the ground that parties have arrived at a settlement.
4. Mr. Pradeep Sharma [petitioner no.1], as well as, Authorized Representative of petitioner no.2 are present in Court and they have been



identified by Mr. Rahul Malhotra, learned counsel for the petitioners.

5. Respondent nos.2 to 10 are also present in Court and they have been identified by the Investigating Officer i.e. S.I. Reena.

6. The case of the prosecution is that at the construction site in Dwarka, where the construction work was being carried out by the petitioners, a wall collapsed resulting in injuries to eight persons and unfortunate demise of one individual namely, Smt. Devi wife of Shri Santosh [respondent no.7]

7. Mr. Malhotra submits that insofar as the injured persons are concerned, the settlement was arrived at to the effect that the petitioners shall pay a sum of Rs.30,000/- each to them. However, the terms of the said settlement have been revised orally. Now each of such respondents are been paid an amount of Rs.45,000/-.

8. He submits that insofar as the deceased is concerned, the claimant in her case is respondent no.7.

9. Issue notice.

10. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the respondent/State accepts notice.

11. He submits that insofar as the injured persons are concerned, the State has no objection with regard to the sufficiency of amount of compensation paid to them.

12. He, however, contends that with regard to the payment of Rs.1,50,000/- which is proposed to be paid as compensation for the death of deceased Smt. Devi, the same is inadequate.

13. At this stage, Mr. Malhotra prays for time to seek instructions with regard to increase of said compensation.

14. Mr. Malhotra's submission, insofar as injured persons are concerned,



is that they have already been paid an agreed amount of Rs.45,000/- each, in the presence of Investigating Officer S.I. Reena, which fact is affirmed by the Investigating Officer, who is present in Court.

15. In view of the above submission, the presence of respondent nos.2 to 6 and 8 to 10 is dispensed with.

16. It is pointed out that Shri Santosh [respondent no.7] has also been paid an amount of Rs.45,000/- since he was also injured. However, he is also the husband of deceased, therefore, he shall make himself available on the next date as well.

17. It is stated by Mr. Malhotra that an amount of Rs.65,000/- has already been paid to respondent no.7 on account of compensation payable to him on account of death of his wife.

18. At request, re-notify on 11.02.2026.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 22, 2025

aj