



\$~41

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1095/2025**

NAVNEET GOEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Suraiya, Advocate alongwith
petitioner in person

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Rupali Bandhopadhyia ASC for
the State with Mr. Abhijeet Kumar
and Ms. Amisha Gupta, Advocates
Mr. Sindhu Sinha, Mr. Shubham
Arora, Advocates and Ms. Binky
Boruah, A.R./Advocate for R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

ORDER

%

26.09.2025

CRL.M.A. 10396/2025 (exemption)

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 1095/2025

3. By way of the instant petition, the petitioner seeks quashing of FIR bearing No. 695/2024 registered at Police Station Kalkalji, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Section 63 of the Copyright Act, 1954 and Section 104 of Trademark Act, 1999 and the proceedings emanating therefrom.



4. The petitioner and Authroized Representative of respondent no. 2 are present before this Court, they have been identified by their counsel and the Investigating Officer from Police Station Kalkaji, Delhi.

5. The FIR in this case was registered on the complaint of Ms. Binky Boruah, the Authorised Representative of respondent no. 2 herein i.e., M/s Michael Kors (Switzerland) International GMBH, wherein it was alleged that on 27.12.2024, a team of police officers from Badarpur Police Station, along with the authorized representative of Respondent No. 2 had visited the premises of the petitioner and had seized counterfeit goods bearing falsified copies of the registered trademarks of the company. Further, pursuant to the seizure of the counterfeit goods from the petitioner's shop, a seizure memo was prepared detailing the number, name, and nature of the goods. The memo was signed by the petitioner, the Inspector, and the authorized representative of the complainant company. It is submitted that a total of 21 infringing goods were seized from the shop "Goel Fashion Shop," located at K-79, Kalkaji, New Delhi. The petitioner however states that he was unaware that the designer bags, he purchased for resale, were counterfeit. In light of the above facts, the petitioner had approached respondent no. 2, i.e. the complainant company, and a Settlement Agreement dated 13.01.2025 was entered between them.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that during the pendency of the aforesaid proceedings, the matter has been settled with respondent no. 2.

7. On a query made by this Court, Authorized Representative of respondent no. 2/company who has been identified by the IO, has categorically stated that they have entered into settlement out of their own



free will, volition without any coercion, pressure or threat and have no objection, if the FIR is quashed.

8. In view of the above facts that the parties have amicably resolved their differences out of their own free will, and without any coercion, no useful purpose will be served by continuing the proceedings, rather the same would create further acrimony between them. It would thus be in interest of justice to quash the above mentioned FIR and the proceedings pursuant thereto. There is no legal impediment in quashing the FIR in question.

9. Accordingly, FIR bearing no. 695/2024 registered at Police Station Kalkalji, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Section 63 of the Copyright Act, 1954 and Section 104 of Trademark Act, 1999 and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

10. In view of above, the present petition stands disposed of.

11. The order be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025/ns