



\$~45

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 4994/2025**
SURESH PUROHIT & ANR.

.....Petitioners
Through: Mr. Dinesh Tiwari, Mr. Firoz Khan &
Mr. Manoj Sharma, Advocates.

versus

**STATE OF N.C. T. OF DELHI THROUGH SHO OF PS LAHORI
GATE & ANR.**

.....Respondents
Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the
State.
Complainant in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER
% **13.10.2025**

CRL.M.A. 21661/2025(Exemption)

Exemption Allowed, subject to all just exceptions

The application stand disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 4994/2025

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No.544/2023 dated 02.11.2023 for the alleged offence under Section 420 IPC (chargesheet filed under Sections 420,411,419,201,120B and 34 of IPC), registered at P.S. Lahori Gate, along with all the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.
2. Briefly speaking, the Complainant/Respondent No.2 alleged that on



28.10.2023, an unknown person impersonating his friend's son contacted him via WhatsApp and persuaded him to arrange money, which was subsequently handed over to an unidentified individual. However, during the course of the investigation, as regards Petitioner No.1, he was linked only to the transaction based on the financial trail, indicating his involvement in receiving and/or facilitating the transfer of the said amount. Petitioner No.2 (Father of Petitioner No. 1) was mentioned only in connection with certain subsequent bank movements as a recipient of Rs. 20,00,000/- (20 Lakhs), without any direct role or allegation by the complainant.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties have now amicably settled the matter by way of Settlement for a sum of Rs. 15,00,000/- (Fifteen Lakhs) *vide* a Settlement Agreement dated 10.09.2024.

3.1 Learned Counsel further submits that the affidavit of no objection to the quashing, duly deposed by Respondents no. 2, has also been placed on record.

3.2 Learned Counsel further submits that per the terms of the settlement, the petitioners have paid Rs. 10,00,000/- (Ten Lakhs) in cash to the Respondent no.2 at the time of executing the settlement agreement, and Rs. 5,00,000/- (5 Lakhs) at the time of quashing of the FIR in question.

3.3 Learned Counsel further submits that keeping in view the compromise between the parties, and since the dispute was purely private in nature, further continuation of the proceedings would be a futile exercise and an abuse of the process of law. Thus, to secure the ends of justice, the FIR in question and the proceedings arising therefrom be quashed.



4. The learned APP for the State in the petition, under instructions, concur with the factum of compromise between the parties and the same has been duly verified, she informs.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsels for the parties, as well as perused the case file.

6. Complainant is present in court. Upon a query put to the complainant *qua* the settlement, he unequivocally submits that the matter has been settled out of his own volition, without any due pressure or coercion from any quarter. He candidly submits that he was under an erroneous impression that the petitioners are also co-conspirators along with the other accused. However, subsequently, he realised his mistake and, in view thereof, does not want to press any charges against them.

7. Having interacted with the Respondent no.2/Complainant and considering the nature of the dispute, it is borne out that the matter is purely private and personal, and lacking any public or societal interest. Furthermore, it appears that the parties have resolved their differences and arrived at a mutual compromise. Since the complainant does not wish to press charges against the petitioners and there is no incriminating material against them, the chances of conviction are almost negligible.

8. Even on a plain reading, and in light of the candid statements of parties, it appears doubtful whether the essential ingredients of the offences invoked under the penal provisions are satisfied. In light thereof, I am of the view that the petition deserves to be allowed on that count as well.

9. Be that as it may, given that the dispute, which seems to have arisen from misunderstanding between the parties, has been resolved, continuing with criminal proceedings may serve no useful purpose. It would be a drain



on judicial resources and abuse of the process of law, especially when dispute does not involve any public interest or interest of the society at large. Continuation of the proceedings, on the other hand, may result in hostility between the parties and defeat the very purpose of the settlement.

10. Quashing the FIRs would rather facilitate the parties in maintaining or restoring cordiality. Therefore, the proceedings deserve to be quashed in the exercise of the inherent powers of the Court. Reference may be had to the judgement rendered in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.* [(2012) 10 SCC 303] in this context.

11. Accordingly, invoking inherent powers vested with this Court under Section 528 BNSS, it is therefore deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question.

12. Consequently, the instant petition is thus allowed. FIR No.544/2023 dated 02.11.2023 for the alleged offence under Section 420 IPC (chargesheet filed under Sections 420,411,419,201,120B and 34 of IPC), registered at P.S. Lahori Gate, and further proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed *qua* the petitioners only.

13. The petition, along with pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

OCTOBER 13, 2025/nk/rs