



\$~28

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1274/2025**

RAMESH KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kedar Yadav and Mr. Rahul Yadav,
Advocates with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel with
SI Raghuraj Singh, PS – Sangam Vihar
and ASI Yashbeer, Traffic.
Ms. Minakshi Yadav, Advocate for
respondent no. 2 with respondent no. 2
in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

14.08.2025

%

1. Quashing of an FIR No. 685/2023 dated 15.09.2023, lodged at Police Station Sangam Vihar and all other consequential proceedings for offence under Section 380 (Theft in dwelling house, etc) of IPC, is sought herein based on the compromise arrived between the parties.

2. Per the FIR, on 11.09.2023, the complainant/Respondent No.2, along with his children, went to Rajasthan to visit Baba Ramdev for darshan. On returning home on 13.09.2023, he found the main gate locked. Upon entering, he discovered that the key to his almirah was still hanging inside the room and, on inspection, found that a gold chain, two rings, and two earrings were

W.P.(CRL) 1274/2025

Page 1 of 4



missing. Subsequently, the aforesaid FIR was registered against unknown persons.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties without any pressure, coercion, threat, or inducement, have amicably resolved their disputes *vide* a Settlement Deed dated 15.04.2025, with a view to preserving family harmony and living peacefully.

4. Learned Counsel for the petitioner further submits that, in view of the compromise between the parties, Respondent no.2/Complainant is not inclined to press charges against the petitioner and proceed further in the matter. He, therefore, urges that the impugned FIR and all consequential proceedings may be quashed based on the compromise.

5. Both the parties are present in the Court and have been identified by their respective counsel and the concerned Investigating Officer. On a Court query, it transpires that complainant and petitioner/accused are real brothers. The complainant candidly submits that he is regretful that, at the relevant time, he had levelled certain allegations against his own brother without knowing the consequences thereof and without realizing which penal provisions would be invoked by the police officials while registering the FIR.

5.1 He submits that he has settled the matter with his brother and would prefer to enjoy the family bonhomie and live peacefully in posterity. Subsequently, they have buried their hatchet and have entered into a compromise, pursuant to which, they wish to enjoy their cordial terms with each other.



6. Learned counsel for the Respondent no. 2/ Complainant and learned APP concur with the fact of compromise and submit that, in view of the compromise, they have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

7. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsel for the Petitioners and Respondent No.2.

8. Having perused the FIR and the case file, it is debatable whether the ingredients of the alleged offences, as per the penal sections invoked in the FIR and even otherwise, are not made out.

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 FIR 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. In the premise, applying the ratio of the decision in ***Gian Singh*** (supra), I deem it just and proper to invoke inherent powers of this Court under Section 528 of BNSS, so as to avoid undue hardship to the private parties to promote mutual good relations and societal peace.



12. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. FIR No. 685/2023 dated 15.09.2023 lodged at Police Station Sangam Vihar and all other consequential proceedings for offence under Section 380 of IPC, against the petitioner is hereby quashed.

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

ARUN MONGA, J

AUGUST 14, 2025/kd