



\$~60 & 84

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

+ **BAIL APPLN. 1872/2026**

MOHD.MUNAZIR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sarthak Maggon with Mr. Abhinav Bhardwaj, Mr. Utkarsh Singh, Mr. Karthik Sharma & Mr. Faizan Ali, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Shubhi Gupta, APP.
SI R.N. Ashang, PS Cyber, N.W.

+ **CRL.M.C. 4540/2026 and CRL.M.As.18851-52/2026**

MOHD. MUNAZIR (THROUGH PAIROKAR)

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sarthak Maggon with Mr. Abhinav Bhardwaj, Mr. Utkarsh Singh, Mr. Karthik Sharma & Mr. Faizan Ali, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Shubhi Gupta, APP.
SI R.N. Ashang, PS Cyber, N.W.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV

ORDER

%

03.07.2026

1. The petitioner's bail application was called out for hearing on 01.07.2026. On that date, the complainant – Mr. Vishal Rana was present



and stated that he did not have any grievance against the petitioner in view of the settlement which had arrived at between the parties. His statement was placed on record and accordingly the petitioner was granted liberty to file the petition for quashing of the FIR.

2. The petitioner, thus, has filed Crl.M.C. 4540/2026. The Court has perused the nature of the allegations against the petitioner and finds that the same is predominantly commercial dispute between the petitioner and the private respondent.

3. The Supreme Court in the case of **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr., (2012) 10 SCC 303**, in paragraph no. 61 has held as under:

“61. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus : the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz. : (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences



arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

4. In view of the law laid down by the Supreme Court in the case of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** (supra) the FIR in question *qua* the petitioner can be quashed on the basis of the settlement which has arrived at and the consent which has expressed by the complainant before the Court.
5. The Court has also placed on record the submissions made by Ms. Shubhi Gupta, learned APP appearing for the State, who contends that the larger conspiracy *qua* the involvement of other accused persons with respect to the FIR may be allowed to be examined by the Prosecuting Agency. The Court leaves it open for the Prosecuting Agency to look into the aforesaid aspect and to do the needful. The quashment of the FIR is only *qua* the petitioner and if the involvement of any other accused is found, the Prosecuting Agency shall be at liberty to do the needful.
6. With these observations, the FIR *qua* the petitioner stands quashed. CrI.M.C. 4540/2026 stands allowed.
7. Let the petitioner be released forthwith.



8. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

PURUSHAINDRA KUMAR KAURAV, J

JULY 3, 2026

tr