$~77

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

% *Date of Decision: 24.09.2025*

+ **CRL.M.C. 3458/2025**

VIJAY KUMAR YADAV .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kamal Singh, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR. .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Naresh Kumar Chahar, APP for the State

CORAM:
HON'BLE DR. JUSTICE SWARANA KANTA SHARMA

JUDGMENT

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J. (*Oral*)

CRL.M.A. 15253/2025 (exemption)

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

CRL.M.C. 3458/2025

3. The petitioner has invoked the jurisdiction of this Court, by way of present petition filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 [hereafter '*BNSS*'] / Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 [hereafter '*Cr.P.C.*'], seeking quashing of FIR bearing no. 0199/2018, registered at P.S. Dwarka South, Delhi for the commission of offence punishable under Sections 420/406/468/471/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 [hereafter '*IPC*'].

4. Briefly stated, the FIR in this case was registered on the complaint of respondent no. 2 alleging that his daughter, Ms. BK, had come across the petitioner through an online matrimonial platform, i.e. *Shaadi.com*. Pursuant thereto, the marriage between Ms. BK and the petitioner had been fixed for 29.06.2018. However, the petitioner had induced her into a transaction involving substantial financial dealings, and thereafter failed to honour his commitments, and thus, cheated and misappropriated her money. It is further alleged that following the breakdown of the proposed matrimonial alliance, respondent no. 2 had got the present FIR registered. After completion of investigation, the Investigating Officer (I.O.) had filed chargesheet against the petitioner.

5. During the pendency of proceedings, the petitioner and respondent no. 2 entered into a compromise and executed a Memorandum of Understanding/ Settlement Agreement, in which it was agreed that the petitioner shall pay Rs. 4,40,000/- to the respondent no. 2, out of which Rs. 3,40,000/- stands already paid to him before the Sessions Court. Thus, the petitioner is before this Court praying for quashing of the abovesaid FIR.

6. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the parties have amicably resolved their disputes. It is pointed out that a Memorandum of Understanding/Settlement Agreement dated 25.04.2025 was executed between the petitioner and respondent no. 2. The said Agreement records that the settlement was entered into voluntarily, without any coercion, undue influence, or pressure of any kind. It is urged that all disputes arising out of the FIR stand

resolved, and nothing further survives between the parties. Therefore, the continuation of criminal proceedings would serve no fruitful purpose, and in view of the settlement, it is prayed that the present FIR be quashed.

7. The learned counsel appearing for the respondent no. 2 also submits that the parties have resolved all the disputes between them and the respondent no. 2 has no objection if the FIR is quashed.

8. The learned APP for the State opposes the present petition, and argues that the offences alleged against the petitioner are grave and involve a clear element of deceit, forgery, and financial exploitation of multiple victims across different jurisdictions. It is argued that the petitioner is a habitual offender, as reflected from several other FIRs registered against him, and that the material collected during investigation, including forged documents and bank records, reveals his deliberate and fraudulent conduct. The learned APP contends that such offences have a serious impact on society at large and cannot be reduced to a private dispute merely because a settlement has been reached between the accused and the victim. It is, therefore, urged that the present petition seeking quashing of FIR on the ground of compromise be dismissed.

9. This Court has **heard** arguments addressed on behalf of the petitioner, respondent no. 2 and the State, and has perused the material on record.

10. The case of prosecution, as emerging from the FIR and the chargesheet, is that the petitioner, Vijay Kumar Yadav, by falsely

representing himself as a pilot with SpiceJet Airlines and a partner in a hotel business at Dwarka, had induced the complainant, Mr. KS, to agree to his marriage with his daughter, Ms. BK. To lend credibility to his claims, the petitioner had shown forged documents purporting to be issued by SpiceJet. On his insistence, the complainant had booked a hotel for the wedding at considerable expense and had also delivered furniture, household items, gold, and clothes for the petitioner and his family. Further, on the eve of the wedding, one Ms. MB, a resident of Indore, Madhya Pradesh, had appeared at a family function and disclosed that the petitioner had cheated her of ₹17 lakhs on a false promise of marriage, and produced supporting court and police documents. When confronted with these allegations, the petitioner had initially denied them but, when presented with an audio recording, had admitted to monetary dealings with her and to the pendency of a complaint filed by her. He had allegedly proposed that he would marry the complainant's daughter and use the money thereby obtained to repay Ms. MB. It was further alleged that the petitioner thereafter attempted to coerce Ms. BK into marriage and threatened the complainant's family with dire consequences if they did not arrange ₹17 lakhs to settle his dispute with Ms. MB. Owing to the distress caused by these incidents, the complainant's daughter had fallen unconscious and required hospitalisation. The complainant had also alleged that even the petitioner's family members had admitted that he had previously engaged in similar fraudulent acts with other women, while the petitioner himself had confessed that his airline documents were fabricated. Thus, the prosecution alleges that the petitioner, by deceitful representations and forged documents, had induced the complainant's family to part with property and valuables and had sought to exploit the proposed marriage for unlawful gain.

11. It was also brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner has been named in multiple other FIRs involving similar allegations of cheating and criminal breach of trust, which revealed a consistent pattern of deceitful conduct. On a perusal of the chargesheet and accompanying material, it is evident that the petitioner had been engaged in systematic and calculated fraudulent activities. The investigation, supported by statements of witness and documentary evidence, reveals that he is a habitual offender involved in creating forged documents and assuming false identities to cheat innocent victims. His *modus operandi*, as reflected from the record, involves creating fake profiles on matrimonial and social networking platforms such as *Shaadi.com* and Facebook, posing as a commercial pilot employed with SpiceJet Airlines, and deceiving women to obtain money or other benefits under the pretext of marriage.

12. The statement of Ms. MB, resident of Indore, Madhya Pradesh, had also been recorded during the investigation. She stated that she had met the petitioner in November 2015 through *Shaadi.com*, where he had introduced himself as a pilot and proposed marriage. On that pretext, he had established physical relations with her and obtained ₹17 lakhs from her for his alleged pilot training. When he neither married her nor returned the money, he had threatened and abused her with caste-based remarks. She later discovered that the petitioner had also cheated several other women in a similar manner. She had

also handed over a copy of her earlier complaint dated 08.09.2016 to the I.O. of the case.

13. Significantly, during the course of investigation, it was confirmed by the concerned official of SpiceJet Airlines that the employment ID, salary slip, and promotion letter in the name of the petitioner were forged and fabricated. Further, analysis of his bank account statements revealed that he had received substantial sums of money from multiple individuals.

14. Furthermore, after his arrest in the present case, the petitioner had pointed out a shop named *Saifi Print*, from where he had got the forged and fabricated documents prepared/printed. The owner of the said shop had confirmed that he knew the petitioner but also stated that he himself had filed a complaint against the petitioner for non-payment of dues.

15. It was further revealed from the chargesheet that three other FIRs had been registered against the petitioner in different jurisdictions – i.e. FIR No. 98/2017 at P.S. Jorbagan, Kolkata; FIR No. 222/2018 at P.S. Dwarka, New Delhi; and FIR No. 0001/2019 at P.S. AJK, Indore – under various provisions of the Indian Penal Code as well as the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act. The petitioner had been arrested in three such cases, including the present one, and was presently on bail.

16. In such facts and circumstances, the petitioner has preferred this petition seeking quashing of FIR – on the basis of settlement – which this Court is not inclined to accept, as even in a case where the

parties have settled the dispute, it is equally important to scrutinize the nature and gravity of the alleged offence well as the wider implications it may have. In ***Parbatbhai Aahir v. State of Gujarat:*** *(2017) 9 SCC 641*, while laying down principles for quashing of FIR in cases of settlement entered into between the parties, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had observed as under:

> "16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.
>
> 16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and
>
> 16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance..."

17. Further, in ***State of Maharashtra v. Vikram Anantrai Doshi:*** *(2014) 15 SCC 29*, the Hon'ble Supreme Court observed as follows:

> "...it is a social wrong and it has immense societal impact. It is an accepted principle of handling of finance that whenever there is manipulation and cleverly conceived contrivance to avail of these kind of benefits it cannot be regarded as a case having overwhelmingly and predominatingly of civil character. The ultimate victim is the collective. It creates a hazard in the financial interest of the society. The gravity of the offence creates a dent in the economic spine of the nation."

18. In the present case, the nature of the allegations and the material collected during investigation reveal that the offences attributed to the petitioner are neither trivial nor of a purely private nature. The allegations against the petitioner involve deliberate acts of cheating, criminal breach of trust, and forgery committed through misrepresentation and fabrication of documents. To reiterate, the investigation, as reflected in the chargesheet, demonstrates that the petitioner had created forged employment credentials purporting to be issued by SpiceJet Airlines and used such documents to deceive multiple victims under the guise of being a commercial pilot. The bank account analysis further revealed the receipt of substantial sums of money from several individuals, corroborating the allegations of financial exploitation of victims. Moreover, the petitioner's involvement in multiple FIRs registered in different States for similar offences also *prima facie* reveals his pattern of cheating victims, and his *modus operandi* of creating false identities, preparing forged documents, and duping unsuspecting victims through online matrimonial and social platforms.

19. Such conduct cannot be viewed as a private dispute capable of settlement between the parties; and rather, the same has wider social implications. Considering the nature as well as manner of commission of the offence, and the larger impact on society, this Court finds no ground to treat the present case as a mere private dispute warranting the exercise of inherent jurisdiction for quashing of FIR on the basis of settlement; neither any case is made out for

quashing of FIR on merits in view of prima facie material collected against the petitioner during the course of investigation.

20. The present petition is therefore unmerited and is accordingly dismissed.

21. Nothing expressed hereinabove shall tantamount to an expression of opinion on merits of the case.

22. The judgment be uploaded on the website forthwith.

DR. SWARANA KANTA SHARMA, J

SEPTEMBER 24, 2025/
T.D.