



\$~20

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2640/2023 & CRL.M.As. 31167/2023, 3380/2024, 25548/2025**

DR. SNOOPY PUNJ

.....Petitioner

Through: Ms. Jasvinder Kaur, Ms. Urvashi Sood and Mr. A. Khan, Advocates with Petitioner (in-Person).

versus

THE STATE & ORS.

....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC (Crl.) with Mr. Alok Sharma, Advocate for State.

SI Dharmendra Sharma, P.S. Patel Nagar and SI Neeraj Chaudhary, P.S. Crime Branch, Chanakyapuri.

SI Sarita, P.S. Uttam Nagar.

Mohd. Zianddin and Mr. Yameen Khan, Advocates for R-2 and R-3 with R-2 & R-3 (through VC).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

16.10.2025

%

1. The present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973²) seeks quashing of FIR No. 620/2021 dated 22nd November, 2021, registered under Sections 420/34 of the Indian Penal Code,

¹ "BNSS"

² "CrPC"



1860³ at P.S. Patel Nagar, Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. The case of the Prosecution emanates from a complaint lodged by Puneet Bahri (Respondent No. 2), alleging that he and Respondent No. 3 were fraudulently induced by Mr. Deepak Sharma, Snoopy Punj (Petitioner), Ricky Punj, and other co-accused, to enter into an agreement for the purchase of a property. It is alleged that accused Deepak Sharma falsely represented himself as the agreement-to-sell holder and highest bidder in a DRT auction of the subject property, showing forged and misleading documents, including photocopies of demand drafts and an agreement to sell. Relying on these representations and further assurances from the Petitioner, who introduced himself as the actual owner and shareholder, Respondent No. 2 paid approximately ₹55.6 lakhs to Deepak Sharma. Similarly, Respondent No. 3 made additional payments totalling ₹60.75 lakhs to the accused. Despite repeated follow-ups, the property was neither converted to freehold nor registered in their names. Later, the Complainants discovered that one Vinod Punj, who holds a 50% share in the property, is alive and residing in Canada, and had never authorized the sale. It was further revealed that the accused had obtained a false surviving members certificate from the SDM office through fraud and misrepresentation, thereby cheating the Complainants of a total of approximately ₹1.15 crores. The accused are alleged to have committed offences of cheating, criminal conspiracy, and forgery, and also defrauded the government by misusing official documents. Based on this complaint, the subject FIR came to be registered. Upon conclusion of investigation, chargesheet was filed under

³ “IPC”



Sections 420/467/468/471/201/177/34/120-B of the IPC.

3. The parties state that, with the intervention of common friends, colleagues and other respectable members of society, the Complainants have amicably resolved the dispute with the accused and have decided not to pursue the present FIR against them. Pursuant to this settlement, a Memorandum of Understanding⁴ dated 1st May, 2025 has been executed between the Complainants with the Petitioner and co-accused Kartika Punj. A copy of the MoU is placed on record and has been perused by the Court. As per the terms of settlement, the accused have agreed to transfer the ownership and possession of the subject property to the Complainants for a consideration of INR 3,00,00,000/-.

4. In view of the settlement, the Complainants, who appear before the Court *via* video conferencing and are identified by the Investigating Officer, unequivocally state that they do not wish to pursue the FIR proceedings. They confirm that their decision to settle the matter is voluntary and made without any undue influence or coercion. It is further clarified by the Complainants that, although accused Deepak Sharma is neither a signatory to the MoU nor arrayed as a Petitioner in the present petition, they have no objection to the quashing of the FIR *qua* him as well. In light of the amicable resolution between the parties, the Petitioner seeks quashing of the subject FIR and all proceedings arising therefrom.

5. The Court has considered the submissions of the parties. While the offences under Sections 467, 468, 471, 201 and 177 of IPC are non-compoundable, Section 420 of IPC is 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.**⁵ 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 exercise in futility.”

[Emphasis added]

7. Further, in **Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.**,⁶ 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

⁴ “MoU”

⁵ (2012) 10 SCC 303

⁶ (2014) 6 SCC 466



***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]

8. The Complainants in the present case 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.



9. In view of the foregoing, the present petition is allowed, and FIR No. 620/2021, P.S. Patel Nagar, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

10. However, since the State machinery was set in motion based on the impugned FIR, it is appropriate to impose costs on the Petitioner. Accordingly, the Petitioner is directed to deposit INR 10,000/- with the Delhi Police Welfare Fund within a period of four weeks from today. Proof of payment be submitted with the concerned IO.

11. The parties shall remain bound by the terms of settlement.

12. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of along with pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

OCTOBER 16, 2025

as