



\$~54

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4231/2025 & CRL.M.A. 18458/2025**

ANMOL YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. B. S. Jakhar, Mr. Vikram Singh
Jakhar, Mr. Neeraj Jakhar, Ms.
Bhawna Jakhar, Mr. Viraj Rathee and
Mr. Shubham Dabas, Advocates
alongwith petitioner (VC)

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr.Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State
Advocate for the complainant
alongwith the victim

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

12.08.2025

%

1. Petitioner herein seeks compromise quashing of an FIR No.504/2016 dated 29.10.2016, registered at Police Station Anand Vihar, for the offences punishable under Sections 384/506 of IPC read with Section 12 of POCSO Act.

2. Per the FIR, Respondent No. 2 was 15 years old at the time of the incident and was allegedly harassed by the petitioner/accused, a Facebook friend, who demanded money, abused her upon refusal, and threatened to circulate objectionable photographs and videos despite having already received a substantial amount from her. The complaint in this regard was made by her father, Respondent No. 3.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that a dispute had arisen between the petitioner, aged 26 years, and Respondents No. 2 and 3, which, at the time of registration of the present FIR, involved Respondent No. 2 being a minor, though she has since attained majority. The disputes, being purely personal in nature, have now been amicably settled *vide* MOU dated 29.04.2025, and Respondents No. 2 and 3 wish to move on with their lives without any association with the present case or the petitioner.

4. I have interacted with the complainant and respondent no.3, who is present in Court. Though a reading of the FIR in question suggests that serious allegations were made against the petitioner at the relevant time in respect of offences under Sections 384 and 506 IPC read with Section 12 of the POCSO Act, upon a query put to the victim, who is now a major, states that the petitioner is a family acquaintance and that they were Facebook friends. Respondent no.3, being fully conscious of her rights, candidly states that she has settled the matter with the petitioner of her own volition, without any duress or coercion.

4.1 As regards the allegations under Section 384 IPC, the investigation yielded no incriminating material against the petitioner, and the respondent no.3 has also stated that false allegations were levelled by her on the advice of others, without understanding the adverse consequences. She has now expressed regret for having done so, acknowledges the implications of the law, and has states that she does not wish to press any charges against the petitioner.

5. Having heard the parties and having regard to the nature of the dispute, the same appears private in nature, involving no public or societal interest.



6. Therefore, in such circumstances, to secure the future of the parties and to establish peace rather than promote hostility, this is a fit case to exercise inherent power under Section 528 of BNSS in quashing the FIR in question. The continuation of criminal proceedings in such circumstances would only cause irreparable harassment and hardship and may even tarnish and spoil the reputation of the victim, whereas quashing would allow the parties to enter into mutual cordiality. Reference in this context may also be made to the judgment in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*,[(2012) 10 SCC 303]**.

7. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.504/2016 dated 29.10.2016 registered at Police Station Anand Vihar, for the offences punishable under Sections 384/506 of IPC read with Section 12 of POCSO Act, along with all consequential proceedings arising there from are hereby quashed.

8. The petition, along with pending applications, if any, stands disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

AUGUST 12, 2025
dy