



2026:DHC:7246



\$~92

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

*Date of Decision: 24<sup>th</sup> August, 2026*

# CNR No. DLHC010394852026

+ CRL.M.C. 6211/2026

ABHINAV @ ROBIN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abdul Gaffar with Mr. Badre  
Munir, Advocates with petitioner in  
person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for the  
State with SI Gaurav, PS  
Chankyapuri.  
Mr. Sudhir Vats, Advocate for  
respondent No.2 with respondent No.2  
in person.

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

1. Petitioner herein seeks quashing of FIR No.148/2022 dated 11.08.2022, registered at Police Station Chankya Puri, for commission of offences under Sections 307 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. The abovesaid FIR was registered on the basis of complaint lodged by Sh. Vikas Kumar. The complainant is friend of accused Abhinav and they both were residing together in a *jhuggi*. The incident took place on 10.08.2022 when they were drinking and when at about 9:30 pm, the complainant asked for contribution of rent from the accused, it resulted in quarrel. The accused (petitioner herein) attacked the complainant with a sharp



cutter type object which resulted in injuries on his neck.

3. Charges have already been ascertained and, so far, eight witnesses have been examined *albeit* the complainant is yet to enter into witness box. It is submitted that his deposition was not recorded as, in the interregnum, there was settlement between the parties and, therefore, only the present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR.

4. Copy of *MoU* dated 21.05.2026 is on record.

5. Respondent no. 2 is present in person and he has been duly identified by his counsel. The concerned Investigating Officer has joined the proceedings through *video-conferencing* and he has also identified him.

6. When asked, respondent No. 2 reiterated the terms of abovesaid settlement. He submits that the accused has already paid him compensation of Rs.1,00,000/- as reimbursement of his expenditure on his medical. He submits that he has entered into the abovesaid settlement out of his own free will, without any coercion and influence from any corner whatsoever. He states that he has already pardoned the accused and submits that, being friends, he would have *no objection* to the quashing of FIR.

7. The applicant remained in custody for about two months in the present case and has, reportedly, no involvement in any other case. During course of the arguments, he, again, apologized for his such said act and conduct and undertakes not to commit any such act in future.

8. It is no longer *res integra* that proceedings, even in non-compoundable cases, can be quashed on the basis of settlement provided that the Court is satisfied that there was no meaningful purpose in continuing with the proceedings. Reference be made to *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.* (2012) 10 SCC 303, *Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*:



(2014) 6 SCC 466, *Dimpey Gujral w/o Vivek Gujral and Others Vs. Union Territory Through Administrator, UT, Chandigarh and Others*: (2013) 11 SCC 497, *Naushey Ali and Others Vs. State of Uttar Pradesh and Another*: (2025) 4 SCC 78. Reference be also made to the following observations made in *Antonnette Promilla Fernanadez v. State NCT of Delhi and Another*: 2026 SCC OnLine Del 809:-

*"15. It is now well settled that, even in the case of non-compoundable offences, the High Court may exercise inherent powers, recognised by Section 482 of the CrPC and Section 528 of the BNSS, to quash proceedings based on a compromise between the parties. However, the aforesaid power is discretionary, and certain principles have been laid down, which guide the Court in adjudicating an application of this nature."*

9. Reference be also made to judgment passed by Co-ordinate Bench in *Mohd. Umair @ Umer Vs. State (Govt. NCT of Delhi) and Ors. & Anr.*: Crl. M.C. 674/2021 (DoD: 12.03.2021).

10. Herein, since the parties have amicably resolved the dispute, going ahead with the proceedings would be futile and the ends of justice would require putting final quietus. The complainant and accused were friends and roommates. The incident took place at spur of moment, with no pre-mediation. They want to continue with their friendship in future and, therefore, seek quashing. State has also left it to this Court to pass appropriate order.

11. Keeping in mind the overall facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations, and the fact that the parties have amicably settled their dispute, this Court is of the considered view that the continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. The settlement appears to be voluntary and has brought an end to the dispute between the parties.



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.

12. Consequently, FIR No.148/2022 dated 11.08.2022, registered at Police Station Chankya Puri, for commission of offences under Sections 307 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is, hereby, quashed subject to petitioner depositing total cost of Rs. 10,000/- with *Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee* within six weeks from today. Proof of deposit of cost alongwith *MoU* dated 21.05.2026, original affidavits, copies of which have been placed on record in the present proceedings, shall be submitted before the learned Trial Court within further two weeks, so that these become part of Trial Court Record.

13. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

**(MANOJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**AUGUST 24, 2026/st/sk**