



\$~11

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4137/2025**

PRATAP CHANDRA@CHAND & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Neeraj & Ms. Shweta
Soni, Advs. along with all
the three petitioners.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State.
SI Shamsheer Singh, PS Pul
Prahladpur.
Mr. Neelkanth Kumar,
Adv. for R-2 along with R-
2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **21.07.2025**

CRL.M.A. 18115/2025 (exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 4137/2025

3. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No.180/2017 dated 22.09.2017, registered at Police Station Pul Prahlad Pur, for offences under Sections 354/323/506/509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC').

4. It is alleged that on 21.09.2017, Petitioner No.1 came to the shop of Respondent No.2 and misbehaved with her. It is alleged that Petitioner No.1 hit Respondent No.2 on her chest and threw away all the goods of her shop as well. Thereafter, on 22.09.2017, Petitioner No.1 again went to the shop of



Respondent No.2 with some ~~son~~ and threatened her. This led to the registration of the present FIR.

5. In her statement under Section 164 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, Respondent No.2 alleged that on 21.09.2017, after Petitioner No.1 had misbehaved with her, Petitioner Nos. 2 and 3 came there and gave beatings to Respondent No.2. Respondent No.2 further alleged that the said accused persons had broken her shop and threatened Respondent No.2 and her family with dire consequences.

6. Charges were framed against the petitioners for offences under Sections 380/34, 323/34, 427/34, 506(II)/34, 509/34 and 451/34 of the IPC. Petitioner No.1 was also charged for the offence under Section 354 of the IPC.

7. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties are neighbours and the altercation took place due to petty misunderstanding. He further submits that the parties have amicably resolved their disputes and they have decided to bury their disputes and live peacefully in future.

8. The present petition is filed on the ground that the parties have settled the dispute before Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi by way of settlement dated 07.08.2024, on their own free will, without any coercion, undue influence, pressure or threat. It is stated that a sum of ₹40,000/- has already been given to Respondent No.2 as compensation as well.

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

10. The petitioners apologise for their conduct. They undertake to not indulge in any such activity in future. They further undertake that they will not harass Respondent No. 2 and her family members in any manner whatsoever.



11. Respondent No. 2, on being asked, states that she is satisfied with the apology tendered by the petitioners. She states that she does not wish to pursue any proceeding arising out of the present FIR and has no objection if the same is quashed.

12. Offences under Sections 323/427/509/451 of the IPC are compoundable in nature, whereas offences under Sections 354/380/506(II) of the IPC are non-compoundable.

13. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') (erstwhile Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) can quash offences which are non-compoundable under the Code on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant. The Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down parameters and guidelines for High Court while accepting settlement and quashing the proceedings. In the case of **Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr. : (2014) 6 SCC 466**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had observed as under :-

"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.



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)

14. Similarly, in the case of **Parbatbhai Aahir & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Anr. : (2017) 9 SCC 641**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had observed as under :-

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The



provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. **Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.**

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil



dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. *Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.*

16.9. *In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and*

16.10. *There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”*

(emphasis supplied)

15. In the present case, Respondent No. 2 has stated that she has no remaining grievance against the petitioners, who are neighbors of her and that she is satisfied with the petitioners' unconditional apology. In the peculiar circumstances of this case, it is unlikely that the present FIR will result in a conviction when Respondent No. 2 does not wish to pursue the case. In such circumstances, continuance of the proceedings would only cause harassment and heartburn amongst the parties.

16. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and the fact that the parties have amicably settled the dispute, 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. I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS.

17. However, keeping in mind the fact that the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

18. In view of the above, FIR No.180/2017 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of total cost of ₹10,000/- by petitioners, to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society, within a period of three months from date.

19. Proof of deposit of cost be submitted to the concerned SHO.

20. The present petition is allowed in aforesaid terms.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

JULY 21, 2025

“SK”