



\$~29

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 2600/2025**

KAPIL YADAV & ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Soumava Karmakar, Mr Nishant Singh, Advocates along with the Petitioner No. 1, 2 & 3 in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for the State.

Ms. Jyoti Bajaj, Advocate along with Respondent No. 2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

% **24.11.2025**

1. This petition under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973²) seeks quashing of FIR No. 92/2025 dated 25th April, 2025, registered under Sections 115(2), 126(2) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023³ at P.S. South Campus, Delhi, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 23rd April, 2025 at about 04:30 PM, the Complainant, Angad Kumar Singh, President of the Students' Council of Aryabhata College, was physically assaulted by an unknown person using a blunt object within the college premises, pursuant to a pre-

¹ "BNSS"

² "CrPC"



planned conspiracy. He alleged that the assailant was seen with certain students, namely, Tarun Yadav, Kapil Yadav, Sonu Yadav, Akshit Shaini, Sachin Meena and Mohit, against whom he raised strong suspicion of involvement. Based on the complaint, the impugned FIR was registered.

3. Respondent No. 2 has amicably resolved the dispute with the Petitioners and has decided not to pursue the present FIR against them. In this regard, a Memorandum of Understanding/Settlement Agreement dated 24th June, 2025, has been executed between the parties.

4. A copy of the MoU has been placed on record and perused by the Court. As per its terms, Respondent No. 2 has voluntarily resolved all disputes and differences with the Petitioners and has given his no objection to the quashing of the FIR. It is also noted that the impugned FIR names other suspects, namely, Sachin Meena, Tarun Yadav, Akshit Shaini and Mohit, who are not parties to the present petition. However, Respondent No.2, in his No Objection Certificate/Affidavit, has unequivocally stated that he has no surviving grievance against any of the Petitioners or the other suspects and has consented to quashing of the FIR *qua* all of them. This position is also reflected in the MoU, wherein Respondent No. 2 records his intention not to pursue the matter against any of the persons named in FIR.

5. The Complainant, who appears in person and is duly identified by the Investigating Officer, confirms the execution of the settlement and reiterates that he does not wish to continue with the FIR proceedings against the Petitioners or the other suspects named in the FIR. He further affirms his decision to settle the matter is voluntary and free from any pressure, coercion or undue influence.

³ “BNS”



6. The Court has considered the aforementioned submissions. It is pertinent to note that the offences under Sections 115(2) and 126(2) are compoundable in certain circumstances. However, that does not debar the High Court from resorting to its inherent power under Section 528 BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 CrPC) 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 parties have amicably settled the matter, this Court is of the view that continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. In the circumstances, this is a fit case for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 528 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 above, and considering that the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the Petitioners are put to cost.

9. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed and FIR No. 92/2025, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed, subject to payment of a cost of INR 3,500/- by each of the Petitioners to the Delhi Police Welfare Fund, within a period of four weeks from today. Proof of deposit of cost be placed before the IO within 2 weeks thereafter.

10. The parties shall remain bound by the terms of settlement.

11. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of along with pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 24, 2025/MK