



\$~61

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4012/2025 & CRL.M.A. 17462/2025**

AJAY KUMAR AND ANRPetitioner

Through: Mr. Shubham Singh &
Mr. Saurabh Dahiya,
Advs.
Petitioners in person

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh,
APP for the State
SI Deepak Lathwal, PS-
DIV/OND
Mr. Hariom & Ms. Preeti,
Advs.
R2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **30.05.2025**

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 54/2025 dated 22.01.2025, registered at Police Station Narela, for offences under Sections 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC').

2. The brief facts are that the petitioners approached Respondent No. 2 for the purpose of purchasing paddy. It is alleged that petitioners had induced Respondent No. 2 in supplying them with large amounts of paddy with no intention to pay for the same.

3. It is further alleged that the petitioners threatened to kill Respondent No. 2, whenever she had enquired regarding



payment for the amount of paddy supplied to them.

4. The present petition has been filed on the ground that the parties have amicably settled all their disputes by way of a Compromise Deed dated 27.05.2025, with the intervention of well-wishers, respectable persons of the society and Panchayat members, of their own free will, without any coercion, pressure or threat.

5. The learned counsel for Respondent No. 2 states that Respondent No. 2 is satisfied with the settlement amount and they do not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the present FIR.

6. The parties are present in person and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. The learned Additional Standing Counsel for the State submits that the offence is compoundable in nature and has no objection if the FIR is quashed. Respondent No. 2, on being asked, reaffirms the submission made by State.

8. Offence under Section 420 of the IPC is compoundable in nature.

9. This Court is of the opinion that no useful purpose would be served by relegating the parties to the learned Trial Court for filing an application to compound the offence.

10. 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.



11. In view of the above, FIR No. 54/2025 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed on the ground of settlement.

12. The present petition is allowed in aforesaid terms. Pending applications also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MAY 30, 2025

“SS”