



\$~40

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1437/2025

**RISHABH CHAUHAN & ORS.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Abhishek Thakur & Mr. Vishal Thakur, Advocates with petitioners in person.

versus

**THE STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI) & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the State with ASI Udaya Rana, SI Kuldeep Singh.  
Complainant in person.

**CORAM:  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA**

**ORDER  
13.10.2025**

%

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No.506/2020 dated 06.06.2020 for the offences under Sections 323, 452, 427, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Raj Park, along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise.
2. The complainant/respondent no.2 and the petitioners are neighbours. Allegedly, the petitioners along with their friends, entered his house and



assaulted his wife (respondent no.3), son (respondent no.3) and daughter (respondent no.4) and vandalized the property and threatened the family etc.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the parties have now amicably settled the matter *vide* MOU/ Settlement Deed dated 04.02.2025. He further submits that the affidavits to the effect of no objection to the quashing dated 04.02.2025, duly deposed by respondent nos. 2, 3 and 4, have also been placed on record.

3.1 He also submits that keeping in view that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and differences arising out of a misunderstanding, further continuation of proceedings would thus be a futile exercise and would cause undue hardship to all parties and their families.

4. Learned counsel for respondent nos.2, 3 and 4 along with learned APP for the State both concur with the factum of compromise and submit that, pursuant to the settlement, the proceedings deserve to be quashed.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsel for the parties as well as perused the case file.

6. The parties are present in Court, and I have interacted with them. Upon a query put to respondent nos.2, 3 and 4, they candidly submit that they have amicably resolved their differences with the petitioners and have entered into the settlement of their own free will, without any pressure, coercion, or undue influence. They further state that the allegations against the petitioners, who are immediate neighbours and well-acquainted with each other, arose from a misunderstanding which, in the heat of the moment, escalated into an unsavoury incident. The parties jointly submit that they regret that a minor dispute, which could have been resolved amicably, escalated into a physical scuffle resulting in the present FIR. In view of the



settlement, the respondent nos.2, 3 and 4 thus submits that they do not wish to pursue the proceedings against the petitioners any further.

7. Upon hearing the parties and examining the nature of the dispute, it is borne out that the FIR was lodged out of a misunderstanding. Even on a plain reading, and in light of the candid statements of parties, it appears doubtful whether the essential ingredients of the offences invoked under the penal provisions are satisfied. In light thereof also, I am of the view that the petition deserves to be allowed on that count as well.

8. Be that as it may, given that the dispute has been resolved, continuing with criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would be a drain on judicial resources and continuation of the proceedings may rather result in hostility between the parties and cause unnecessary hardship to the parties, defeating the very purpose of the settlement.

9. Moreover, the respondent nos.2, 3 and 4 do not wish to press charges against the petitioners and there is no incriminating material against them, coupled with the fact that the parties have amicably compromised the matter, further criminal proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law.

10. In the premise, this is a fit case for invoking inherent powers vested with this Court under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 and it is thus deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question. Reference may also be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*** [(2012) 10 SCC 303].

11. Accordingly, the FIR No.506/2020 dated 06.06.2020 for the offences under Sections 323, 452, 427, 506, 34 of IPC, registered at Police Station



Raj Park, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, including those pending before the Court is hereby quashed.

12. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

**ARUN MONGA, J**

**OCTOBER 13, 2025/nk/rs**