



\$~68

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 5314/2025, CRL.M.A. 22888-22889/2025**

JAI DEEP & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Geeta Luthra, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Aadarsh Kothari, Ms.
Ananya, Advocates

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for the State
with SI Sonia, PS Defence Colony
Mr. Bharat Monga, Advocate for R-2
Respondent No. 2 in person (through
VC)

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA**

ORDER

06.08.2025

%

1. The present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (earlier Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973²) seeks quashing of FIR No. 47/2023³ under Sections 506/509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860⁴, registered at P.S. Defence Colony and all proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. Briefly stated, the case of the Prosecution against the Petitioners emanated from a complaint filed by Respondent No. 2, stating that she,

¹ "BNSS"

² "Cr.P.C."

³ "impugned FIR"

⁴ "IPC"



along with her children resided on the 2nd Floor of 26, Anand Lok, while her mother-in-law, who visited their house at times, resides on the 1st Floor. She alleged that since July 2022, her mother-in-law had engaged bouncers, including Petitioner No. 2, to harass her. Petitioner No. 2 allegedly intimidated Respondent No. 2 until he was removed from the position in February 2023. After his removal, Petitioner No. 1 took over, who is also accused of harassing and intimidating Respondent No. 2. Feeling threatened, the Complainant called the police, and lodged a written complaint, culminating in the registration of the impugned FIR under Sections 506/509 of IPC. After completion of investigation, chargesheet was filed against Petitioner No. 1 under Sections 506/509 of IPC, whereas Petitioner No. 2 was placed in Column No. 12.

3. The parties state that they have amicably resolved all their disputes and differences. Respondent No. 2 has decided not to pursue the impugned FIR against the Petitioners. A Compromise Deed dated 29th July, 2025, has also been executed between the Petitioners and Respondent No. 2, a copy whereof has been placed on record and perused by the Court.

4. As per its terms, Respondent No. 2 has agreed to voluntarily give her no objection to the quashing of the impugned FIR.

5. Respondent No. 2, who has appeared before the Court *via* video conferencing mechanism and is identified by the Investigating Officer, unequivocally states that she does not wish to pursue the impugned FIR proceedings. She confirms that her decision to settle the matter is voluntary and made without any undue influence or coercion. In light of the amicable resolution between the parties, the Petitioners seek quashing of the subject FIR and all proceedings arising therefrom.



6. The Court has considered the submissions of the parties. It is pertinent to note that the offences under Sections 506 and 509 of the IPC are compoundable at the instance of the aggrieved parties. However, that does not debar the High Court from resorting to its inherent power under Section 528 of BNSS (formerly, Section 482 of Cr.P.C.) and pass an appropriate order so as to secure the ends of justice.
7. Having regard to the nature of the dispute and the fact that the aggrieved party/Respondent No. 2 has amicably settled the matter, this Court is of the view that continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. In these circumstances, this is a fit case for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS, as the continuance of proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law and impede the ends of justice.
8. In view of the foregoing, the present petition is allowed and FIR No. 47/2023 registered at P.S. Defence Colony and all proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.
9. The parties shall remain bound by the terms of settlement.
10. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of along with pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

AUGUST 6, 2025/ab