



\$~94

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3570/2025, CRL.M.A. 15715/2025

PUSHKAR JAT & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Shubham Kaushik, Advocate
along with Petitioners (through VC).

versus

THE STATE (GOVT.OF NCT OF DELHI) & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the State
with SI Talwinder Singh PS Cyber
East Delhi.
Mr. Rajat Sharma, Advocate for
Respondent-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

22.09.2025

%

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No. 028/2023 dated 21.04.2023 for the alleged offences under Sections 419/420/120-B of IPC, registered at Cyber Police Station East, Delhi, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.

2. Per FIR, the complainant was duped in a cyber scam after being contacted via WhatsApp by a woman, who offered a part-time job. After receiving ₹300 for an initial task, she was added to a Telegram group and lured into a fraudulent cryptocurrency platform. She was later manipulated into transferring ₹7,80,725 to accounts operated by Petitioners Nos.1 to 3.



When she refused to invest further and asked for her money back, she was removed from the telegram group. The FIR was registered based on her statement.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the parties have now amicably settled the matter by way of settlement for a sum of Rs.8,50,000/- *vide* MOU/Settlement Deed dated 13.06.2023.

3.1 Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that, in view of the compromise between the parties and as Respondent no. 2 is not inclined to press charges against the petitioners, and no grievance whatsoever is left amongst the parties.

3.2 Learned counsel lastly submits keeping in view the compromise between the parties, since the offences against the petitioners are compoundable in nature coupled with the fact that the charges have not yet been framed and no charge sheet has been filed, further continuation of the proceedings would be a futile exercise. Thus, in order to secure the ends of justice, and to bring the dispute between the parties to a quietus, the interference of this Court is warranted and the FIR as well as all consequential proceedings be quashed.

4. The learned APP for the State in the petition, under instructions concur with the factum of compromise between the parties and the same has been duly verified, she informs.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsels for the parties and have perused the case file.

6. Respondent No. 3/complainant, upon a query, candidly submits that in view of the settlement arrived at, the complainant is not inclined to press charges against the petitioners. She further submits that the settlement has



been arrived at voluntarily, without any duress or coercion and thus, continuation of further proceedings would not serve any fruitful purpose.

7. Having interacted with the complainant and considering the nature of the dispute, it is borne out that the matter is purely private and personal, arising from a financial transaction, and lacking any public or societal interest.

8. Even on a plain reading, and in light of the candid statements of parties, it appears doubtful whether the essential ingredients of the offences invoked under the penal provisions are satisfied as it was a civil dispute based on voluntary remittance of money from one party to the other. In light thereof, I am of the view that both the petitions deserve to be allowed on that count as well.

9. Thus, the commercial transaction which resulted in the FIR seems to be rather a case of certain professional deficiency and not deliberate attempt of cheating or forgery. The same is also duly admitted by the informer/complainant who states that at the relevant time the FIR arose out of complete misunderstanding on the part of both the parties.

10. Given that the dispute, which seems to have arisen from misunderstandings between the parties, 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.

11. Quashing the FIRs 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.

12. Accordingly, invoking inherent powers vested with this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS, it is therefore deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question.

13. Consequently, the instant petition is thus allowed. The criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No. 028/2023 dated 21.04.2023 for the alleged offences under Sections 419/420/120-B of IPC, registered at Cyber Police Station East, Delhi, and further proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

14. The petition, along with pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025/rs/nk