



\$~71

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 5082/2025**

SHIVAM MITTAL & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Deepti with Mr. Rahul and Mr.
Shivendra Kumar, Advs.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State.

SI Satyam Pandey, PS GK-I.

Ms. Karishma S. Naik (through V.C.)
and Mr. C.M. Gopal, Advs. for R-2
with R-2 (through V.C.).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

%

30.07.2025

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No. 299/2021 dated 13.11.2021 under Sections 354, 506, 509 and 34 IPC, registered at P.S. Greater Kailash, New Delhi, along with all the proceedings arising emanating therefrom, on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

2. Per the FIR, the dispute between the parties arose from Respondent No.2's tenancy of the property at C-30, Pamposh Enclave, New Delhi, which was leased by Petitioner No.3. Respondent No.2 faced financial difficulties and was unable to pay rent, following which Petitioner No.3 and his associates allegedly threatened her, including an incident on 25th September 2021 when unknown persons, purportedly sent by Petitioner



No.3, forcibly entered her house, abused and physically threatened her, and demanded immediate payment.

2.1. Petitioner No.1 is the Son in law of Petitioner No.3, while Petitioner No.2 is the Son of Petitioner No.3.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties out of their own volition and without any duress or coercion, have now amicably settled all their disputes *vide* Settlement Deed dated 21.07.2025.

4. Learned Counsel further submits that, in view of the amicable settlement of disputes between the parties, the continuation of proceedings arising from the aforementioned FIR would serve no useful purpose. It is, therefore, appropriate for the FIR and all proceedings arising therefrom in relation to the petition to be quashed.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsel for the Petitioners and Respondent no. 2, as well as perused the material available on record.

6. The parties have joined the proceedings through video conferencing, have been identified by their respective counsels, and I have interacted with them.

7. On a query put to the complainant, she candidly states that she does not wish to press any charges against the complainant in view of the settlement. As regards the allegation made in the FIR, she submits that the same resulted in the heat of the moment when the altercation took place between her and the petitioners. She did not at the relevant time appreciate the consequences of the same leveling allegations qua Section 354 of IPC. She regrets having done it and does not, therefore, wish to press such charges against the petitioners/accused anymore.



8. The petitioners have shown remorse for their conduct and they undertake not to repeat the same in future. Complainant/Respondent No. 2 also affirms that she has entered into the aforementioned settlement agreement out of her own free will, volition and without any coercion. She further states that she has no objection if the present FIR and consequent proceedings are quashed.

9. On a court query, whether there is any objection regarding the compromise between the parties, the learned APP for the State does not dispute it.

10. In view of the above, the continuation of further proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law. The matter arises out of a personal dispute which has since been amicably resolved between the parties. The allegations, even if taken at face value, do not disclose any serious or heinous offence and appear to stem from a spur-of-the-moment altercation over a civil issue, lacking any element of criminal intent.

11. Moreover, allowing the criminal process to continue would serve no meaningful purpose, as it would unnecessarily burden the judicial system and waste the valuable time of the investigating agencies and the Court. Prolonging the proceedings would only perpetuate animosity between the parties. In this context, reference may be had to judgment rendered in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr., [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

12. Consequently the criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No. 299/2021 dated 13.11.2021 under Sections 354, 506, 509 and 34 IPC, registered at P.S. Greater Kailash, New Delhi, along with all the proceedings arising emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

13. Petition is allowed as above. The parties shall remain bound by the



statements made in Court today.

14. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

JULY 30, 2025/akc