



\$~57

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4972/2025**

RUMIT MANN & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Prateek Lakra and Mr. Avi Kalra,
Advs. with petitioners.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for State
with Insp. O. P. Mandal, PS Raj Park
and Insp. Rajeev Kumar, ATO PS
Ashok Vihar.
Mr. Sandeep Mishra, Adv. for R-2 &
3 with R-2 & 3 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

% **28.07.2025**

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of FIR No. 0453/2019 dated 19.10.2019, under Sections 384/342/506/120B IPC, registered at P.S. Ashok Vihar, Delhi on the basis of amicable settlement between the parties.
2. Per FIR, the complainant, who runs a second-hand luxury car business under the name "Some Big Wheels", alleged that the petitioners, who were known to him, attempted to forcibly obtain possession of an Audi A6 car. They threatened his staff, and also abducted the complainant's manager, Mr. Tarun Tandon, in a Black Scorpio vehicle before releasing him later near Keshav Puram Metro Station.
3. It is now the case of the petitioners that the dispute was essentially

CRL.M.C. 4972/2025

Page 1 of 4



personal in nature and has been resolved amicably. A duly executed settlement deed dated 07.07.2025 has been placed on record, in which the complainant has expressed his no-objection to the quashing of the FIR and proceedings. The petitioners submit that in view of this compromise, the continuance of the criminal case would amount to abuse of the process of law and serve no useful purpose.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners *inter alia* relies *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2014) 6 SCC 466, *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, and *Ramgopal v. State of Madhya Pradesh*, (2021) 12 SCC 673 to contend that where the dispute is essentially private and has been resolved between the parties, and no societal interest is involved, the Court may exercise its inherent powers to quash the FIR even if the offences are non-compoundable.

5. Per contra, learned APP for the State opposes the petition and submits that the allegations in the FIR are serious and disclose offences of extortion and abduction, which cannot be said to be merely private in nature. It is argued that such offences have implications on public safety and law and order, and cannot be permitted to be quashed solely on the ground of compromise.

6. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and respondent as well perused the material available on record.

7. Parties are present in Court. I have interacted with them.

8. On a query put to the complainant, who had levelled the allegations at the time of registration of FIR in question qua robbery and extension, involving the car which was stated to have been forcibly taken by the petitioners/accused, he very candidly states that was not aware of the Penal



Sections to be invoked by the prosecution at the time of reporting the matter to police. He states there appears to be certain serious miscommunication qua the taking away of the car by the petitioners by using force, as the car at no point of time was in possession of the petitioners.

9. The complainant would further submit that the car was throughout with him and even currently also in his possession. He is using the same.

10. Furthermore, the complainant on his own volition informs the Court that he is in business of sale purchase of cars and in past he had business transaction with the petitioners who had purchased one vehicle from him. Infact, on the fateful day, they had come as prospective customers. However, there was some misunderstanding in course of the negotiations qua the price of the vehicle, which resulted in heated altercations. The subsequent FIR arose out of the unsavoury incident, which was not intended to have any criminal intent.

11. In the aforesaid premise, taking a wholesome view of the matter and in view of the parties having arrived at a mutual understanding and amicably settled the differences with each other, further continuation of the criminal proceedings will be an abuse of process of law as there is no likelihood of any conviction. Infact, not only the continuation thereof will result in waste of precious time of the trial court but also wasteful expenditure from the public exchequer coupled therewith hostile, giving result to unnecessary animosity between parties in future instead of letting them enjoy the bonhomie arising out of the mutual settlement. Accordingly, in terms of the guidelines laid down in the case of ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***, FIR in question and the consequential proceedings therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of costs of Rs.15,000/- per



petitioner (total of Rs. 60,000/-) to be deposited with Delhi Legal Aid Services Authority (DLASA) within a period of four weeks from today.

ARUN MONGA, J

JULY 28, 2025/akc