



\$~61

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3483/2025**

MR. SANT LAL AGGARWAL & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. P.S. Singal, Mr. S.P. Malik, Ms. Chhavi Jain, Ms. Aruna Gupta and Mr. Satendra Kumar, Advocates alongwith Petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP for the State with SI Mahendra Patel, P.S. Narela. Mr. Chanakya Gupta, Advocate for R-2 along with R-2/Mr. Vikas Gupta in person (through Vc).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

% **26.05.2025**

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 seeks quashing of FIR No. 349/2019, under Sections 406/420/120B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Narela and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Bhujali, learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, North, Rohini Courts, Delhi.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that during the pendency of the proceedings, the latter have settled the matter with respondent no. 2 vide a compromise deed dated 01.04.2025. In pursuance of the said settlement,



respondent no. 2 has no objection if the present FIR is quashed.

4. Petitioners appear in-person before the Court today and complainant/respondent no. 2 appears through Video Conferencing are present before the Court and have been duly identified by their respective counsel, as well as the Investigating Officer, Sub Inspector Mahendra Patel, P.S. Narela.

5. The matter was also placed before the learned Joint Registrar who has recorded the statements of both the parties and passed the following order dated 19.05.2025:

“1. The present non contentious petition has been filed by the petitioners under Section 528 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 for quashing of the FIR NO. 349/2019 Under Sections 406/420/120-8/34 of the Indian Penal Code registered at P.S. Narela on the basis of settlement arrived at between the parties.

2. As per the submissions, the matter between the petitioners and R-2 has been amicably settled. P-2 is appearing through virtual mode and vide separate submission he stated that matter has been amicably settled.

3. Vide separate statement recorded in this behalf, P-1 and 3 stated that dispute between petitioners and R-2 has been amicably settled as per the settlement deed dated 01.04.2025. The settlement has been arrived at between the parties herein without any force, coercion, undue influence and pressure. They have signed the settlement deed with their wish and will. Vide separate statement recorded in this behalf, R-2 stated that dispute between R-2 and petitioners has been amicably settled as per the settlement deed dated 01.04.2025. The settlement has been arrived at between the parties herein without any force, coercion, undue influence and pressure. The settlement deed has been signed with wish and will.

4. Investigating Officer is present in Court and has duly verified the identity of both the parties. Separate statement of Investigating Officer has also been recorded.

5. The parties along with their counsels have confirmed that the settlement deed has been duly entered into between them.

6. Learned counsel for State/APP enters appearance and accepts notice. He submits that in view of the statement recorded, let the



matter be placed before the Hon'ble Court.

7. The compromise/settlement deed is in writing and has been duly signed by both the parties. I have heard both the parties and from the direct dialogue with both the parties, it is observed that the consent of both the parties is found to be genuine and has not been obtained under undue influence or pressure.

8. In view of the above, matter be placed before the Hon'ble Court on 26.05.2025.

6. Learned APP for the State, on instructions of the Investigating Officer, submits that another person, namely , Satish Kumar Pahwa, who was kept in Column no. 12 of the chargesheet, was summoned.

7. Mr. Vikas Gupta, complainant/respondent no.2, who appears through Video Conferencing states that he does not wish to pursue the present FIR any further as all his claims have been settled including the aforesaid, Mr. Satish Kumar Pahwa.

8. In **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

“61. ... In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

9. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and the fact that the parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 349/2019, under Sections 406/420/120B/34 of the



IPC, registered at P.S. Narela and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Bhujali, learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, North, Rohini Courts, Delhi.

10. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 349/2019, under Sections 406/420/120B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Narela and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Bhujali, learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, North, Rohini Courts, Delhi, is hereby quashed, subject to an aggregate cost of Rs. 2,00,000/- to be deposited by the petitioners with the **“DHCBA Cost Account”** in **A/c No. 15530110179338** in **UCO Bank, Delhi High Court Branch (IFSC No. UCBA0001553)**, within 10 days from today.

11. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

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

13. Copy of the order be sent to the concerned learned Trial Court for necessary information and compliance.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 26, 2025/bsr/sc

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)