



\$~48

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 3830/2025 and Crl.M.A. Nos. 16762/2025 &18758/2025
ANIL KUMARPetitioner

Through: Mr.A.K.Pandey, Advocate
versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Ms. Piyanka Dalal, APP for State
with SI Shubanshu, PS Kalyanpuri
Mr.Deepak Kumar, Advocate with R-
2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

%

11.08.2025

1. Petitioner herein seek compromise quashing of the criminal case bearing Misc. Crl. No. 15/2024 titled as “Ram Vir Singh Vs. Anil Kumar” wherein learned JMFC (MCD), Karkardooma Court, Delhi *vide* impugned order dated 24.04.2024 directed SHO P.S. Kalyanpuri to lodge an FIR under appropriate Sections of the IPC.
2. *Vide* the impugned order dated 24.04.2024, the learned JMFC noted that the allegations disclose cognizable offence in the nature of cheating, conspiracy, criminal breach of trust and criminal mis-appropriation and thereby directed SHO P.S. Kalyanpuri to lodge an FIR under appropriate Sections of the IPC and any other law. Pursuant to the aforesaid order, the petitioner herein filed a revision petition bearing No.96/2024 which was dismissed by the learned Principal and Sessions judge, Karkardooma Court, Delhi *vide* judgment dated 26.03.2025 as no grounds and basis could be made out.
3. The complainant alleged that in 2016 the petitioner, posing as



proprietor of *Maurya Samooch City*, induced him to purchase plots in U.P., collecting payments for five plots booked in the names of the complainant and his wife. Despite full instalments being paid, possession was never given, and it was later discovered the petitioner had no ownership of the land. In 2021, the petitioner issued a refund cheque of ₹2,50,000 which bounced twice, leading to NI Act proceedings. Although the matter was settled in December 2023 for ₹6,00,000 before the Delhi Mediation Centre, the petitioner failed to honour the settlement and stopped appearing, prompting the complainant to seek FIR registration.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have amicably resolved their disputes before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts on 23.12.2023, as recorded in the settlement deed (Annexure A), arising out of Case No. 122/2022 and Misc. Crl. 15/2024. The settlement was for a full and final amount of ₹6,00,000/-, and therefore nothing now survives in the present matter.

4.1 Counsel further submits that though the petitioner was earlier under severe financial distress, residing with his wife, aged mother, and two minor children, he nevertheless honoured the settlement by paying the entire agreed sum to respondent no. 2. The payments were made in cash as follows: ₹50,000/- on 29.06.2024, ₹1,50,000/- on 04.07.2024, ₹50,000/- on 12.09.2024, and ₹3,50,000/- on 23.04.2025. With these payments, the settlement stands fully complied with.

4.2 It is submitted that the petitioner is not a habitual offender and the dispute being purely private in nature has been amicably settled. Respondent no. 2 has received the entire amount and nothing remains due. Hence, continuation of proceedings would serve no purpose and amount to an abuse



of process of law.

5. Learned APP for the State and the counsel for the respondent no.2 do not dispute the factum of settlement. Respondent no.2 also has no objection in view of the compromise.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the case record.

7. Respondent no. 2 is present in Court and, upon interaction, candidly submits that the settlement dated 23.12.2023 was entered into voluntarily, without coercion, threat, or undue influence. He further affirms that no amount remains due and he has no objection to quashing of the proceedings.

8. Having considered the submissions and material on record, it is evident that the dispute, arising out of a financial transaction of private nature, has been amicably resolved. The complainant himself does not wish to pursue the case.

9. It also transpires from the record that no FIR was registered, as the impugned order dated 24.04.2024 passed by the learned MM (MCD) was stayed by this Court on 04.07.2025.

10. In view of the above, continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would amount to a drain on judicial resources. Since the matter involves no element of public interest, allowing the proceedings to continue may only generate hostility and undermine the settlement, whereas quashing the same would promote cordiality between the parties.

11. In the premise, in the larger interest of justice, 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. Consequently, the complaint case Crl. Misc. 15/2024 titled “*Ram Vir Singh Vs. Anil Kumar*”, as well as the order dated 24.04.2024 *vide* which SHO P.S. Kalyanpuri was directed to register an FIR, both stand quashed subject to payment of costs of Rs.15,000/- as litigation charges to be paid by the petitioner to respondent no.2 and the I.O. shall ensure compliance of payment of costs.

13. The petition, along with pending application(s), if any, is disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

AUGUST 11, 2025/SV