



\$~100, 109 & 110

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 3574/2025 & CRL.M.A. 15731/2025**

AJEET & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: *Appearance not given by counsel.*
Petitioners present (in-Persons).

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for State.
Complainants (in-Persons).

+ **CRL.M.C. 2474/2025 & CRL.M.A. 11065/2025**

INDERJEET @ TINKU & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: *Appearance not given by counsel.*
Petitioners present (in-Persons).

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP with Mr. Adarsh Singh, Mr. Jaideep, Mr. Rajesh Dahiya, Mr. Deepak Tomar, Ms. Deepti Sejwal, Mr. Rohtash Singh Rana and Mr. Karan Singh Rana, Advocates for State.
Complainants (in-Persons).

+ **CRL.M.C. 3523/2025 & CRL.M.A. 15516/2025**

AJEET AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: *Appearance not given by counsel.*
Petitioners present (in-Persons).

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar, APP for State.



Complainants (in-Persons).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

% **25.09.2025**

1. The present petitions under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973¹ (now Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023²), seeking quashing of the following FIRs:

(i) CRL.M.C. 3574/2025: FIR No. 1/2017 dated 1st January, 2017 under Sections 341/323/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860³, registered at P.S. Kalyanpuri, Delhi, at the instance of Chander Pal against Ajeet and Satish Kumar;

(ii) CRL.M.C. 2474/2025: FIR No. 491/2018 dated 30th September, 2018 under Section 323/354/354B/34 of IPC, registered at P.S. Kalyanpuri, Delhi, at the instance of XXXX against Chanderpal, Vinay and Inderjeet @ Tinku; and

(iii) CRL.M.C. 3523/2025: FIR No. 490/2018 dated 30th September, 2018 under Sections 323/354/354B/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Kalyanpuri, Delhi, at the instance of YYYY against Ajeet, Sateesh Kumar and Abhishek.

2. Briefly stated, the facts leading to the filing of the aforesaid FIRs, are as follows:

2.1. FIR No. 1/2017 was registered pursuant to a complaint filed by Chander Pal, alleging that on 1st January, 2017, the accused, Ajeet, Satish and Abhishek, who are his neighbours, physically assaulted him and his

¹ "CrPC"

² "BNSS"

³ "IPC"



children while under the influence of alcohol. It was specifically alleged that Ajeet physically assaulted Chander Pal by punching and kicking him while accused Satish, who was armed with a *danda*, struck him on his left leg. When his children attempted to intervene, the accused physically assaulted them. It is further alleged that the accused hurled verbal abuses at the Complainant's daughter and also threatened to kill the Complainant and his family. Pursuant to the said complaint, FIR No. 1/2017 was registered against Ajeet and Satish. Since Abhishek was a minor at the time of the incident, his case was dealt with separately and has already been disposed of by the Juvenile Justice Board.

2.2. On the other hand, FIR No. 491/2018 was registered pursuant to a complaint filed by XXXX, alleging that on 28th September, 2018, when the Complainant and her daughter were at Block No. 9, Trilokpuri, a scooter being driven by Chander Pal and Vinay touched the foot by the Complainant. When the Complainant asked them to be careful, they started hurling abuses at her. Shortly thereafter, accused Inderjeet @ Tikku arrived at the scene and, along with the other co-accused, physically assaulted the Complainant and her family members. The Complainant was allegedly hit on her hands and chest, and Inderjeet @ Tikku is said to have torn her kurta. Pursuant to the said complaint, FIR No. 491/2018 was registered against Chander Pal and his sons, Inderjeet and Vinay. However, accused Chander Pal passed away on 18th August, 2019 and the proceedings *qua* him were abated. A death certificate to this effect has also been placed on record.

2.3. FIR No. 490/2018 was registered on the basis of a complaint lodged by Ms. YYYY, daughter of Chander Pal, alleging that on 28th September, 2018, the Complainant witnessed the accused persons, Abhishek, Satish, and



Ajeet, verbally abusing and physically assaulting her father and brothers. When the Complainant attempted to intervene, accused Satish allegedly assaulted her as well, pulled her hair, and tore her kurta from the left side. As a result of the altercation, Chander Pal reportedly sustained injuries, including a broken tooth and bleeding. Based on this complaint, FIR No. 490/2018 was registered.

3. In the above cross FIRs, the chargesheets have been filed against the respective accused persons and the matter is pending consideration of the Trial Court. The parties, present in person and duly identified by the Investigating Officer, submit that during the pendency of proceedings in the aforementioned cases, they have amicably resolved their disputes with the intervention of their relatives and other respectable members of society. In furtherance of this settlement, a Settlement Agreement dated 18th September, 2023, has also been executed before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, a copy whereof is placed on record, and has been perused by the Court. The said agreement pertains to the impugned FIRs as well as FIR No. 561/2018, registered at Police Station Kalyanpuri, which has already been compounded on 23rd September, 2023.

4. In view of this settlement, the Complainants present in Court, have expressed their unequivocal intent not to pursue the FIR proceedings. They confirm that their decision to settle the matter is voluntary, and free from any pressure, undue influence or coercion.

5. The Court has considered the submissions of the parties. While the offences under Sections 354 and 354B of the IPC are non-compoundable, Sections 323, 325, 341, 506 and 509 of the IPC are compoundable in certain cases, with the permission of the Court.



6. It is well settled that in the exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 CrPC (now Section 528 BNSS), the Court may, in appropriate cases, quash proceedings in respect of non-compoundable offences if the parties have reached a genuine settlement and no overarching public interest is adversely affected. The Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.**⁴ has held as follows:

*“11. As discussed above, offence punishable under Section 186/332/353 of the IPC are non-compoundable being of serious nature, **however, if the Court feels that continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in this case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored, it can order for quashing of the FIR or criminal proceedings as it is the duty of the Court to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process.***

12. In view of the law discussed above, considering the Settlement arrived at between the parties and the statements of respondent no.1 & 2, I am of the considered opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus as continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an an exercise in futility.”

[Emphasis added]

7. Further, in **Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.**,⁵ the Supreme Court held as follows:

“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.

⁴ (2012) 10 SCC 303

⁵ (2014) 6 SCC 466



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]

8. Although the offences under Sections 354 and 354B of the IPC cannot be treated as strictly ‘*in personam*’, and they touch upon public concerns rather than being confined to individual grievances, the Court must also account for the practical realities of securing a conviction in the present case. The Supreme Court has consistently held that in cases where the complainant has entered into a voluntary and *bona fide* settlement, and is no longer inclined to support the prosecution, the prospect of securing a conviction becomes exceedingly remote. In such circumstances, continuing the prosecution may not only prove futile, but would also serve no worthwhile public interest.

9. The Complainants in each FIR have categorically expressed their



unwillingness to pursue the matter further and have confirmed the settlement as voluntary and devoid of any coercion. Given this background, the continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public resources unnecessarily. Having regard to the totality of circumstances, and in view of the legal principles laid down by the Supreme Court, this Court finds the present case to be an appropriate one for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. to secure the ends of justice.

10. However, since the State machinery was set in motion pursuant to the registration of the cross FIRs, it would be appropriate to impose costs on the parties. Accordingly, each of the Petitioners and Respondents shall deposit a sum of INR 3,500/- with the Delhi Police Welfare Fund within a period of four weeks from today. Proof of such deposit shall be furnished to the concerned Investigating Officer.

11. In view of the foregoing, the present petitions are allowed, and FIR No. 1/2017, FIR No. 491/2018 and FIR No. 490/2018, all registered at P.S. Kalyanpuri, and all proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

12. The parties shall abide by the terms of settlement.

13. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of.

14. Pending applications, if any, are disposed of as infructuous.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

SEPTEMBER 25, 2025

as