



\$~55

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 429/2025 & CRL.M.A. 3908/2025**

KARAN LAKRA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Harmet Singh Gulati & Mr. Anchit Sangwan, Advocates along with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE G.N.C.T OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC for the State with SI Manish Kalkal, P.S. Kirti Nagar.
Mr. Arhum Sayeed & Mr. Rahil Ahmed, Advocates for R-2 along with R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA

ORDER

%

21.02.2025

1. This petition has been filed seeking the following relief: -

It is, therefore, most respectfully prayed to this Hon'ble Court that keeping in view the facts and circumstances of the petition, the Hon'ble Court may kindly be pleased to quash the **F.I.R. bearing No.216/2024, U/s 420/406 IPC** registered under the jurisdiction of P.S. Kirti Nagar, Delhi, in the interest of justice

2. By way of the present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS'), the Petitioner, seek quashing of case FIR No. 216/2024 registered under Sections 420/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Jagatpuri, Delhi.

3. In light of the practice directions dated 24.12.2024 in relation to



dealing with the petitions seeking quashing of FIR based on compromise, the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) vide order dated 17.02.2025 has recorded that the parties have resolved their disputes and have agreed to amicably resolve all their disputed.

4. The statements of the complainant i.e. Respondent No. 2 has been recorded, copy of which have been appended to the order dated 17.02.2025.

5. The matter pertains to the commercial transaction and the entire amount due and payable to the complainant has been paid over by the Petitioner herein. In this regard it would be apposite to refer to the Judgement of the Supreme Court in **Parbatbhai Aahir v. State of Gujarat**¹, wherein the Supreme Court has laid down the parameters to be considered by the Court while exercising the inherent powers under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The relevant paragraph of the said judgment is noted as under: -

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

¹ (2017) 9 SCC 641



16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

....

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and"

(Emphasis Supplied)

6. In the light of the aforementioned Judgement and in line with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in **Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr²**. as also in **Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr³**, this Court sees no reason why the subject FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom should not be quashed. This Court is of the view that in light of the settlement between the contesting parties, continuing with the subject FIR and all subsequent proceedings would be an exercise in futility and would not be conducive to peace and harmony between the parties.

² (2012) 10 SCC 303

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466



7. Accordingly, FIR No. 216/2024 registered under Sections 420/406 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 registered at Police Station Jagatpuri, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
8. The Investigating Officer ('IO') is directed to apprise the Trial Court with respect to the quashing of the FIR.
9. Petition stands disposed of.
10. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.
11. The digitally signed copy of this order, duly uploaded on the official website of the Delhi High Court, www.delhihighcourt.nic.in, shall be treated as a certified copy of the order for the purpose of ensuring compliance. No physical copy of order shall be insisted by any authority/entity or litigant.

MANMEET PRITAM SINGH ARORA, J
FEBRUARY 21, 2025/mt
[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)