



\$~15

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2501/2025 & CRL.M.A. 11192/2025

SUCHITA GOYAL & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Shri Singh, Mr.
Kumar Mihir, Ms.
Malvika Awasthi, Mr.
Shamik Narain, Mr. Athul
Joseph, Advocates.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh,
APP for the State with SI
Satish Kumar, PS Prashant
Vihar.
Mr. Raghav Ranjan
Srivastava, Advocate for
R-2 and 3 along with R-2
and 3 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

04.07.2025

%

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 2/2020 dated 03.01.2020, registered at Police Station Prashant Vihar for offences punishable under Sections 406/420/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'), including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. The charge sheet has been filed in the present matter.
2. The brief facts are that the petitioners induced Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 to purchase a shop bearing no. G-23, Ground Floor in the RG Mall, Sector-9, Rohini, Delhi-110085, on the assurance



of petitioners that the subject shop was free from all sorts of encumbrances and that Petitioner No. 1 has the absolute right and title to sell the said shop. On the assurance of Petitioner No.1, and after the execution of the Agreement to Sell dated 24.08.2018, Respondent No.2 agreed to purchase the said shop for a total consideration of ₹22,50,000/-. Both of them entered into an agreement and a part payment of ₹17,50,000/- has been made by Respondent No.2 and two undated cheques of the balance amount viz. ₹5,00,000/- (₹2,50,000/- each) were also handed over to the petitioners. When Respondent No.2 approached the petitioners for execution of the sale deed they kept avoiding the same on one pretext or another. Later the complainant found that the subject shop was mortgaged with Allahabad Bank, Ground Floor, 17, Parliament Street, Connaught Place, New Delhi-110001.

3. The present petition has been filed on the ground that the parties have amicably settled all their disputes by way of a Compromise cum Settlement Agreement dated 08.01.2025, with the intervention of well-wishers, respectable persons of the society and Panchayat members, of their own free will, without any coercion, pressure or threat.

4. Respondent Nos.2 and 3/Complainants are present in the Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer. The learned counsel for the complainants states that the complainants are satisfied with the settlement and they do not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the present FIR.

5. The Petitioners are carrying the original sale deed dated 15.01.2025 of the subject property, executed pursuant to the settlement so arrived at between the parties. The said sale deed is handed over to the learned counsel who represents the



complainants. All the terms of the settlement have been complied with.

6. The learned APP for the State submits that the offences are compoundable in nature and has no objection if the FIR is quashed. Respondent No. 2, on being asked, reaffirms the submission made by State.

7. Offences under Section 420/406 of the IPC are compoundable in nature.

8. This Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by relegating the parties to the learned Trial Court for filing an application to compound the offence.

9. It is further submitted that as a gesture of goodwill, a sum of ₹50,000/- shall be paid to Respondents No.2 and 3, over and above the amount referred in the settlement agreement.

10. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the dispute alive and continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of Court.

11. However, keeping in mind the fact that the charge sheet has been filed and the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

12. In view of the above, FIR No. 2/2020 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of cost of ₹20,000/- (to be equally borne by the petitioners) to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of six weeks from date.

13. Let the proof of deposit of cost and payment of ₹50,000/- to Respondent No. 2 be submitted to the concerned Investigating Officer.



14. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.
Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JULY 4, 2025/DU