



\$~53

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 5158/2025 & CRL.M.A. 22326/2025**

ASHOK KUMAR PANDEYPetitioner
Through: Mr. U.M. Tripathi, Adv.
with the petitioner in
person.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI
AND ANOTHERRespondents
Through: Ms. Kiran Bairwa, APP
for the State with SI Kapil
Dev, PS Saket.
Mr. Abhishek Saxena,
Adv. for R-2 (through VC)
Mr. Upendra Kumar
Pandey, Authorized
Representative of R-2
(through VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **11.08.2025**

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 425/2013 dated 11.10.2013, registered at Police Station Saket, for the offence under Section 408 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC'), including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. It is alleged that on 31.01.2013, a sum of ₹1,63,200/- was given to the petitioner, who was an accountant of Respondent No. 2 company, for depositing the same into the company's account. On scrutiny, it was found that the said account was not deposited and a forged prepared deposit slip was found in the



records. It is alleged that the slip was prepared by the petitioner and the bank also declared the slip to be forged. Thereafter, a complaint was filed against the petitioner on 31.08.2013, pursuant to which, the petitioner entered into a compromise with Respondent No.2 and issued a cheque in favour of Respondent No.2. It is further alleged when the cheque was deposited in the bank for clearance, the petitioner stopped the payment. The same led to registration of the present FIR. Chargesheet has been filed against the petitioner for offences under Sections 408/174A of the IPC.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the FIR was registered pursuant to a misunderstanding over a monetary dispute between the petitioner and Respondent No.2 company. He submits that the dispute has since been resolved between the parties. He further submits that the petitioner inadvertently did not appear for the proceedings, which led to him being chargesheeted for the offence under Section 174A of the IPC.

4. The present petition is filed on the ground that the matter has amicably been settled between the parties, out of their own free will, without any force, pressure, threat, undue influence or coercion. The present petition is supported by a duly sworn no objection affidavit tendered by the authorized representative of Respondent No.2, namely, Mr. Upendra Kumar Pandey.

5. The petitioner is present in person in Court today. Mr. Upendra Kumar Pandey, authorized representative of Respondent No. 2, has joined the proceedings through video conferencing. The parties have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.



6. A copy of the Board Resolution of Respondent No.2 company authorizing Mr. Upendra Kumar Pandey as the Authorized Representative has been handed over in Court today.

7. The learned counsel for Respondent No. 2 also affirms that Mr. Upendra Kumar Pandey has been appointed as the Authorized Representative of the complainant company.

8. Mr. Upendra Kumar Pandey, on being asked, states that all the disputes have been settled and Respondent No.2 company does not wish to pursue any proceedings arising out of the present FIR and it has no objection if the same are quashed.

9. Offence under Sections 408 of the IPC is compoundable whereas offence under Section 174A of the IPC is non-compoundable.

10. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') (erstwhile Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) can quash offences which are non-compoundable 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)

11. 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)

12. Although the offence under Section 174A of the IPC is serious in nature, it is pertinent to note that the dispute essentially relates to embezzlement of funds and Respondent No.2 has since compromised the matter with the petitioner. Considering that Respondent No.2 does not wish to pursue the proceedings, it is unlikely that the matter will result in conviction.

13. Keeping in view the nature of the dispute and the fact that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, 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 opinion that this is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS.

14. However, keeping in mind the fact that the FIR was



registered way back in the year 2013 and chargesheet has already been filed in the present case, and the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioner is put to cost.

15. In view of the above, FIR No. 425/2013 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of cost of ₹30,000/- by the petitioner to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society, within a period of eight weeks.

16. Let the proof of deposit of cost be submitted with the concerned SHO.

17. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms. Pending application(s) also stand disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

AUGUST 11, 2025

'KDK'