



\$~28 & 29

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 5703/2025 & CRL.M.As. 24446/2025, 29278/2025**
KESHAV TANWAR & ORS.Petitioners

Through: *Appearance not given*
Petitioners (in-persons).

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP with Mr. Shhireen, Mr. Digvijay Yadav, Mr. Ranbir Saroha, Mr. Mrityunjay Pandey, Ms. Priya Mahajan, Ms. Sneha Saurabh and Mr. Gokul Singh, Advocates for State.
SI Akash, P.S. Bhajanpura and ASI Khursheed Ali, P.S. Jagatpuri.
Mr. Saif Ali, Advocate for R-2.

+ **CRL.M.C. 5763/2025 & CRL.M.A. 24690/2025**

RANJEET SINGH @ GABBU & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Saif Ali, Advocate with
Petitioners (in-Persons).

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP with Mr. Shhireen, Mr. Digvijay Yadav, Mr. Ranbir Saroha, Mr. Mrityunjay Pandey, Ms. Priya Mahajan, Ms. Sneha Saurabh and Mr. Gokul Singh, Advocates for State.
SI Akash, P.S. Bhajanpura and ASI Khursheed Ali, P.S. Jagatpuri.
Appearance not given by counsel for R-2.
Respondent No. 2 (in-Person).



CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
26.09.2025

%

1. The present petitions have been filed under Section 482 of Criminal Procedure Code, 1973¹ (*pari materia* Section 528 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023²), seeking quashing of cross FIRs, the details of which are as follows:

(i) CRL.M.C. 5703/2025 - FIR No. 152/2021 dated 25th March, 2021 under Sections 323/341/427/452/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860³, registered at P.S. Bhajanpura, Delhi, on a complaint lodged by Ranjeet Singh; and,

(ii) CRL.M.C. 5763/2025 - FIR No. 524/2022 dated 13th August, 2022 under Section 323/356/447/34 of IPC, registered at P.S. Bhajanpura, Delhi, on a complaint lodged by Keshav Tanwar.

2. The case of *Ranjeet Singh* (FIR No. 152/2022) is that on 25th March, 2021, 7-8 unknown persons forcibly entered his shop, assaulted him and his family members, vandalized the premises, and threw glass bottles towards his residence, causing injuries and damage to property. He also alleged that certain jewellery items went missing during the incident. On the basis of his statement and the MLCs of the injured persons, offences under Sections 323/341/427/452/506/34 of IPC were invoked. During the course of investigation, CCTV footage was examined and witness statements were

¹ "CrPC"

² "BNSS"

³ "IPC"



recorded, on the basis of which Keshav Tanwar, Bhagwan Dass, Amit, Chetan, and Himanshu Tanwar were identified as accused and subsequently charge-sheeted under Sections 323/341/427/506/325/452/34 of IPC.

3. In contrast, the case of *Keshav Tanwar* (FIR No. 524/2022) is that on the same day, 25th March, 2021, accused Ranjeet, Sandeep, Navdeep, Bhupender @ Bhupi and Nagender, forcibly entered his shop, assaulted him with fists, sticks and a knife, robbed cash, and threatened him with dire consequences. It was further alleged that the Petitioners also intercepted Keshav's vehicle carrying rice bags, assaulted the driver, and snatched the goods. Later the same day, when Keshav's family members intervened, they were also assaulted and money was allegedly taken from the Keshav's pocket under threat. Keshav asserts that although he initially approached the police, no action was taken on his complaint. It was only upon the directions of the Metropolitan Magistrate that his written complaint was treated as an FIR, leading to registration. Upon investigation, offences under Sections 323/356/447/451/506/34 of IPC were made out against Ranjeet, Sandeep, Navdeep and Bhupender and accordingly a chargesheet was filed.

4. The parties, with the intervention of family members and other well-wishers in society, have amicably resolved their disputes. In furtherance of this understanding, *Ranjeet Singh* and *Keshav Tanwar* have executed a Memorandum of Understanding dated 5th August, 2025, setting out the terms of settlement. A copy of the MoU has been placed on record and has been perused by the Court.

5. The complainants in the above-noted FIRs, on behalf of the concerned aggrieved parties, have agreed to bring an end to all hostilities and to jointly seek quashing of the proceedings emanating from both FIRs. Affidavits



supporting this prayer have also been filed and are taken on record.

6. The complainants in both cases are present in person and are duly identified by the IO. They have categorically affirmed that they do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings any further. They have further stated that their decision to settle is voluntary, without any coercion, pressure, or undue influence.

7. The Court has considered the submissions of the parties. While the offences under Sections 356/452 of IPC are non-compoundable, offences under Sections 323/341/427/325/506/447/451 of IPC are compoundable in certain cases. It is well settled that in the exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 CrPC (now Section 582 BNSS), the Court may, in appropriate cases, quash proceedings in respect of non-compoundable offences if the parties have reached a genuine settlement and no overarching public interest is adversely affected.

8. The Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.**⁴ has clarified that even non-compoundable offences can be quashed on the basis of a settlement between the parties if the circumstances so warrant. The relevant portion of the judgment states:

“11. As discussed above, offence punishable under Section 186/332/353 of the IPC are non-compoundable being of serious nature, however, if the Court feels that continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in this case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored, it can order for quashing of the FIR or criminal proceedings as it is the duty of the Court to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process.

12. In view of the law discussed above, considering the Settlement arrived at between the parties and the statements of respondent no.1 & 2, I am of the considered opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus as continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question

⁴ (2012) 10 SCC 303



would be an an exercise in futility.”

9. Further, in *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*,⁵ the Supreme Court held as follows:

“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.”

[Emphasis Supplied]

10. Although the offences under Sections 356/452 of IPC cannot be treated as strictly *in personam*, and they touch upon public concerns rather than being confined to individual grievances, the Court must also take into account the practical realities of securing a conviction in the present case. The Supreme Court has consistently held that in cases where the Complainant has entered into a voluntary and *bona fide* settlement, and is no longer inclined to support the prosecution, the prospect of securing a conviction becomes exceedingly remote. In such circumstances, continuing the prosecution may not only prove futile, but would also serve no

⁵ (2014) 6 SCC 466



worthwhile public interest. The Complainants in the present case have categorically expressed their unwillingness to pursue the matter further and have confirmed the settlement as voluntary and devoid of any coercion. Given this background, the continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public resources unnecessarily. Having regard to the totality of circumstances, and in view of the legal principles laid down by the Supreme Court, this Court finds the present case to be an appropriate one for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. to secure the ends of justice.

11. However, since the State machinery was set in motion pursuant to the registration of the cross FIRs, it would be appropriate to impose costs on the Petitioners. Accordingly, each Petitioner shall deposit a sum of INR 5,000/- with the Delhi Police Welfare Fund. Proof of such deposit shall be furnished before the Investigating Officer within six weeks from today.

12. Subject to the above, the present petitions are allowed and FIR No. 152/2021 dated 25th March, 2021 and FIR No. 524/2022 dated 13th August, 2022 both registered at P.S. Bhajanpura, Delhi, and all proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

13. The parties shall abide by the terms of settlement.

14. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of.

15. Pending applications, if any, are disposed of as infructuous.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

SEPTEMBER 26, 2025

as