



\$~70

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3492/2025

GURPREET SINGH MUDHAR & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Krishan Kumar,
Advocate along with
petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam,
APP for the State with
Insp. Rajesh Kumar, PS
DIU/OND.

Mr. Mukesh Anand,
Advocate for R2 and 3.
Respondent nos. 2 and 3 in
person (through VC).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

27.05.2025

CRL.M.A. 15418/2025 (Exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 3492/2025 & CRL.M.A. 15417/2025 (Stay)

3. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 693/2024 dated 25.09.2024, registered at Police Station Shahbad Dairy for offences under Sections 420/406/447/467/471 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (IPC), including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.
4. The brief facts are that Petitioner No. 1 introduced the complainants to Petitioner No. 2 with respect to the sale of their ancestral land bearing Khasra No. 282, Situated in Village Shah



bad Daulatpur Abadi known as Prahlad Vihar, Near Sector 25 Rohini, Delhi – 110042.

5. It is alleged that an agreement to sell dated 02.05.2022 was executed between Petitioner No. 2 and the complainants with respect to the aforesaid property, whereafter, Petitioner No. 2 advanced an amount of ₹39,00,000/- out of the total consideration amount of ₹3,91,00,000/-.

6. It is alleged that after the said agreement Petitioner No. 1 took away the original sale deed of the property from the complainants on the pretext of showing it to Petitioner No. 2. However, the same was never returned by Petitioner No. 1 despite repeated reminders.

7. It is alleged that on 09.03.2023, the complainants informed Petitioner No. 2 that they were ready with all the documents for the purpose of execution of the sale deed and requested him to be present before the office of the Sub-Registrar on 10.03.2023. Petitioner No. 2 also confirmed receiving all the documents.

8. However, Petitioner No. 2 on 10.03.2023 did not come to the office of the Sub-Registrar, whereafter, on 17.03.2023 the complainants sent Petitioner No. 2 a legal notice asking him to perform his part of the agreement by 27.03.2023.

9. It is alleged that Petitioner No. 2 did not come forward to perform his duties and alleged the said agreement was cancelled as well as the advance amount paid by Petitioner No. 2 stood forfeited.

10. It is alleged that on 19.04.2024 the complainants when visited the said property, were shocked to see that gate from the property had been removed and the property had been portioned into three plots.



11. It is alleged that petitioners trespassed the said property and made a false sale deed in their favor to illegally take the possession of the said property from the complainants.

12. The present petition is filed on the ground that the matter has been amicably settled between the parties by way of Compromise deed dated 10.03.2025.

13. On 19.05.2025, Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 appeared before the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) and gave a voluntary statement that the dispute has been amicably settled *vide* Compromise deed dated 10.03.2025.

14. The learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) noted that the settlement has been arrived between the parties without any force, coercion, undue influence and pressure and the settlement deed has been signed with wish and will.

15. The petitioners are present in person and the complainants are present through video conferencing. They have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

16. The learned counsels for the parties submits that the disputes arose between the parties in regard to an ancestral property. He submits that the complainants and the petitioners are related to each other. The disputes between them have been resolved and the complainants do not intend to pursue the proceedings of the present FIR.

17. Offence under Sections 420/406/447 of the IPC is compoundable whereas offences under Sections 467/468/471 of the IPC are non-compoundable in nature.

18. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('**BNSS**') (*erstwhile* Section 482 of the Code of



Criminal Procedure, 1973) can quash offences which are non-compoundable on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant. The Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down parameters and guidelines for High Court while accepting settlement and quashing the proceedings. In the case of **Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr. : (2014) 6 SCC 466**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had observed as under :-

“29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1. Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

- (i) ends of justice, or*
- (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.*

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on



society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.”

(emphasis supplied)

19. Similarly, in the case of ***Parbatbhai Aahir & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Anr. : (2017) 9 SCC 641***, the Hon’ble Supreme Court had observed as under :-

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.



16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. **Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.**

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

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.”

(emphasis supplied)

20. 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. I am of the opinion that this is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS.

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

22. In view of the above, FIR No. 693/2024 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of cost of ₹20,000/- by the petitioners (to be borne by both the petitioners), to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of four weeks.

23. Let the proof of deposit of cost be submitted with the concerned IO/SHO.

24. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MAY 27, 2025

DU