



2026:DHC:6085



\$~98

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% Date of Decision: 28th July, 2026

+ W.P.(CRL) 2131/2026 & CRL.M.A. 21322-21323/2026

VIRENDER SINGH BIDHURI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ramesh Gupta, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Raj Pal Kasana, Mr.
Shailendra Singh, Mr. Dishant Yadav
and Mr. Abhishek Baisoya, Advocates

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR. Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC (Crl.)
with Mr. Alok Sharma and Mr. Pavitra
Dixit, Advocates for State/R-1
Mr. Asif Zamir, Mr. Bharat and Mr. R.
Radha, Advocates for R-2 along with
R-2
Mr. Ratan Lal, ACP/OPS South-East
and SI Vivek Gautam, PS Badarpur

CORAM:**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN****J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No. 0386/2025 registered at Police Station Badar Pur for commission of offences under Sections 115/126(2)/74/78/324(2)/351(2) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (corresponding Sections 323/341/354/354D/426/506 IPC) along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of settlement arrived at between the parties. Later on, Section 2(1)(r)(s) of *Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989* was also added in the FIR.



2. FIR in question was registered on the basis of report lodged by respondent No. 2 in which she claimed that she came in contact of petitioner when he had approached their hospital in relation to grant of some discount to a patient. According to her, he started talking to her on phone and thereafter started harassing her. He even threatened to eliminate her husband and children. She revealed that on the date of incident, when she was returning home, petitioner blocked her vehicle with his car and threatened to eliminate her and uttered casteist remarks. She was also assaulted in the middle of the road, abused and touched inappropriately.
3. Investigation is, reportedly, complete and according to prosecution, petitioner is not coming forward and, therefore, coercive process has been issued by the learned Trial Court.
4. He is, however, present today in the Court.
5. Respondent No. 2 is present in person and she has been duly identified by her counsel as well as investigation ACP Ratan Lal. She states that she has entered into settlement voluntarily and without any force. She submits that such settlement has taken place with the intervention of respectable persons, elders and well-wishers and that no pressure or coercion and undue pressure is involved. She submits that petitioner had apologized to her and also to her family and has assured that there would not be any such act or incident from his side. She submits that on the basis of such apology tendered by petitioner, she is no longer interested to pursue her complaint.
6. When the matter was taken up on the last date i.e. 22.07.2026, learned Addl. Standing Counsel had prayed for short adjournment as he also wanted to confirm about the aforesaid settlement between the parties.
7. Such fact has now been verified.



8. A status report has been filed.
9. Along with status report, there is also additional statement of respondent No. 2 in which she had been asked specific questions with respect to settlement. She revealed to the concerned investigating officer that since the other side apologized, she was willing to settle the matter. She also claimed that there was no pressure upon her and that settlement was with her own sweet will and volition.
10. Copy of such status report and statement, which is shown during the course of arguments, is taken on record.
11. Mr. Ramesh Gupta, learned Senior Counsel submits that there is no prohibition or embargo in quashing a complaint of the present nature. He refers to *Sukhdev Sharma and Anr. Vs. The State and Anr: Crl. M.C. 7144/2022 (DoD: 09.02.2024)* wherein, this Court, while considering the factum of amicable settlement in a complaint filed under Section 2(1)(r)(s) of *Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989* quashed the proceedings on the basis of the settlement and while quashing, reference was made to one Supreme Court judgment. Relevant portion of the aforesaid order is extracted as under:-

“.....

4. The respondent no.2, who is personally present in Court and has been duly identified by the Investigating Officer (IO), reaffirms the abovementioned settlement and states that he has settled all the disputes with the petitioners of his own free will and without any coercion. The respondent no.2 submits that wants to live in peace with the petitioners, his neighbours, and prays that the subject FIR be quashed.

5. I have perused the contents of the FIR and also the settlement between the parties.

6. In *Ramawatar v. State of M.P.*, (2022) 13 SCC 635, the Supreme Court, while quashing an FIR filed under the SC/ST Act, in the set of facts where



the parties were neighbours and had entered into a mutual settlement, has held as under:

“10. So far as the first question is concerned, it would be ad rem to outrightly refer to the recent decision of this Court in Ramgopal v. State of M.P. (2022) 14 SCC 531, wherein, a two-Judge Bench of this Court consisting of two of us (N.V. Ramana, CJI & Surya Kant, J.) was confronted with an identical question. Answering in the affirmative, it has been clarified that the jurisdiction of a court under Section 320CrPC cannot be construed as a proscription against the invocation of inherent powers vested in this Court under Article 142 of the Constitution nor on the powers of the High Courts under Section 482CrPC. It was further held that the touchstone for exercising the extraordinary powers under Article 142 or Section 482CrPC, would be to do complete justice. Therefore, this Court or the High Court, as the case may be, after having given due regard to the nature of the offence and the fact that the victim/complainant has willingly entered into a settlement/compromise, can quash proceedings in exercise of their respective constitutional/inherent powers.

xxxxx

16. Ordinarily, when dealing with offences arising out of special statutes such as the SC/ST Act, the Court will be extremely circumspect in its approach. The SC/ST Act has been specifically enacted to deter acts of indignity, humiliation and harassment against members of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes. The Act is also a recognition of the depressing reality that despite undertaking several measures, the Scheduled Castes/Scheduled Tribes continue to be subjected to various atrocities at the hands of upper castes. The courts have to be mindful of the fact that the Act has been enacted keeping in view the express constitutional safeguards enumerated in Articles 15, 17 and 21 of the Constitution, with a twin-fold objective of protecting the members of these vulnerable communities as well as to provide relief and rehabilitation to the victims of caste-based atrocities.

17. On the other hand, where it appears to the Court that the offence in question, although covered under the SC/ST Act, is primarily private or civil in nature, or where the alleged offence has not been committed on account of the caste of the victim, or where the continuation of the legal proceedings would be an abuse of the process of law, the Court can exercise its powers to quash the proceedings. On similar lines, when considering a



prayer for quashing on the basis of a compromise/settlement, if the Court is satisfied that the underlying objective of the Act would not be contravened or diminished even if the felony in question goes unpunished, the mere fact that the offence is covered under a “special statute” would not refrain this Court or the High Court, from exercising their respective powers under Article 142 of the Constitution or Section 482 CrPC.”

7. Guided by the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court in its judgment in Ramawatar (Supra), and keeping in view the fact that parties are neighbours and the respondent no.2 does not wish to pursue his complaint any further, as also the Settlement arrived at between the parties, I find that no useful purpose shall be served in continuing with the proceedings of the present FIR as the chances of its success will be rather minuscule and it would rather create further acrimony between the parties and will be an unnecessary burden on the State exchequer.

8. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. FIR No. 493/2021 registered with Police Station: Pul Prahladpur, South-East District, New Delhi under Section 3(1)(r)(s) of the SC/ST Act, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom against the petitioners are quashed.”

12. The situation herein is also, precisely, same and similar.

13. Therefore, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the criminal case pending and to withhold the permission to quash the FIR particularly when the respondent No. 2 has accepted the apology tendered by the petitioner and is not inclined to pursue the case.

14. Petitioner is present in Court and assures that he shall not indulge in such act or conduct in future.

15. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No. 0386/2025 registered at Police Station Badar Pur for commission of offences under Sections 115/126(2)/74/78/324(2)/351(2) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023* (corresponding Sections



2026:DHC:6085



323/341/354/354D/426/506 IPC), along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is quashed subject to petitioner's depositing cost of Rs. 50,000/- with *Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee* within four weeks from today. Let original affidavits of the parties and original *Memorandum of Understanding* be deposited with the concerned SHO/IO within further two weeks so that these become part of record.

16. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

17. Other pending applications also stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

JULY 28, 2026/dr/sk