



\$~84& 85

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1163/2025

NITIN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Mrinal Kaushik, Advocate

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr.Digam Singh Dagar, APP with SI
Nitin Kumar, PS Farsh Bazar
Mr.Rishabh Tyagi, and Mr.Sachin
Yadav, Advocates

+ CRL.M.C. 4441/2025

RAJESH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr.Rishabh Tyagi, and Mr.Sachin
Yadav, Advocates

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr.Digam Singh Dagar, APP with SI
Nitin Kumar, PS Farsh Bazar
Mr.Mrinal Kaushik, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

% **18.08.2025**

Crl.M.A. No.5208/2025 in Crl.M.C. No. 1163/2025

Crl.M.A. No. 19336/2025 in Crl.M.C. No. 4441/2025

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The applications stand disposed of.



CRL.M.C. 1163/2025 and Crl.M.C. No. 4441/2025

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of two FIRs (Cross FIRs), arising out of same dispute i.e. one bearing FIR No.436/2020 dated 14.10.2020, for the alleged offences under Sections 354, 354A, 506 and 509 IPC and the second bearing FIR No. 435/2020, dated 14.10.2020 for the alleged offences under Sections 323, 354, 509 and 506, both registered at Police Station Farsh Bazar, along with all the proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.
2. Briefly speaking, the respective complainants alleged in FIR No. 436/2020 that neighbour Nitin Prakash (Petitioner in CRL.M.C. 1163/2025) used abusive and threatening language during an altercation as well objectionable touch and conduct as well, whereas in FIR No. 435/2020 the complainant alleges that neighbour Rajesh (Petitioner in CRL.M.C. 4441/2025) misbehaved with her mother-in-law. When she intervened, she was allegedly touched, pushed and injured, while her mother-in-law was assaulted.
3. Learned counsels for the parties submit that the parties have now amicably settled all their disputes at Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Court *vide* mediation settlement dated 22.04.2024.
4. Parties are present in person and have been identified by their respective counsel and the concerned Investigating Officer.
5. In response to specific Court queries, parties in person affirm the factum of settlement arrived at between them out of their own volition, without any duress, pressure or coercion from any quarter. The parties further state that they happen to be closely related also, i.e., two real brothers



and their wives and yet they seem to have indulged in a free fight at the time of incident, which has resulted in the unsavoury criminal proceedings lodged by virtue of two cross FIRs.

6. The complainants present in person candidly state there was a complete misunderstanding at the time of family feud, which resulted in the cross fights. They submit that they do not wish to press any charges against the accused who are their respective brothers-in-law.

7. The learned counsel for the respondents and the Learned APP for State concur with the factum of the compromise between the parties and convey their no objection to the quashing of the aforesaid FIRs in question.

8. In the aforesaid backdrop, having heard the rival contentions of the parties and perused the case file and the FIRs, it is otherwise arguable whether the essential ingredients of the alleged offences are made out under the Penal sections invoked.

9. Given that the dispute has been resolved, continuing with criminal proceedings may serve no useful purpose. It would be a drain on judicial resources and abuse of the process of law, especially when dispute does not involve any public interest or interest of the society at large. Continuation of the proceedings, on the other hand, may result in hostility between the parties and defeat the very purpose of the settlement.

10. Quashing the FIRs would rather facilitate the parties in maintaining or restoring cordiality. Therefore, the proceedings deserve to be quashed in the exercise of the inherent powers of the Court. Reference may be had to the judgement rendered in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]*** in this context.

11. Accordingly, exercising the inherent powers vested in this Court



under Section 528 of BNSS, it is therefore deemed appropriate to quash the FIRs.

12. Consequently, the instant petitions are allowed and FIR 436/2020 under Sections 354, 354 A, 509 and 506 IPC, and FIR No. 435/2020 under Sections 323, 354, 509, and 506 IPC, both registered at Police Station Farsh Bazar, Delhi and the criminal proceedings arising there from are hereby quashed, subject to the payment of costs of Rs.5000/- each to be paid by the petitioners to the Delhi Legal Services Authority.

13. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

AUGUST 18, 2025/SV