



\$~90

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6356/2025 and CRL.M.A. 26845/2025

PANKAJ THUKRAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mohd. Shariq, Mr. Umar and
Mr. Wasim Alam, Advocates with
petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State with SI Vipul Tomar, PS – Nabi
Karim.

Ms. Sejal Tayal, Advocate for
respondents no. 2 and 3 with
Mr. Naqeeb Nawab, A.R. (through
VC.)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

%

09.09.2025

1. Petitioner herein seeks compromise quashing of FIR No. 153/2018, dated 24.04.2018, registered under Section 63 of Copyright Act, 1957 and Sections 103/104 of Trade Marks Act, 1999 at Police Station Nabi Karim, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.
2. Briefly put, per the petition, on 24.04.2018, the FIR was lodged on the instance of one, Mr. Himanshu Deora, and a raiding team was formed and a raid was conducted at the premises of the petitioner wherein counterfeited articles were found. Subsequently, on 07.08.2025, a compromise was arrived at between the parties vide a compromise deed.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that, during the pendency of the proceedings, the petitioner and private respondents have entered into Settlement Deed dated 07.08.2025 which is placed on record as **(Annexure P-4)**.

4. Both, the counsel for respondents and the learned APP for the State concur with the factum of the compromise between the parties. Learned counsel for complainants convey his no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard the parties' counsels and interacted with the complainant who is present before this Court. It so appears that they have settled their differences without any duress and coercion and out of their free will.

6. Complainant has joined through video conference on a query by the Court, he submits that the disputes between the parties arose out of the misunderstanding and the same has been amicably resolved. He does not wish to press any charges and, therefore, the FIR be quashed. He would submit that the allegations in the FIR were leveled at the relevant point of time due to wrong understanding of criminal law and subsequently, he realized that no such ingredients are made out and the dispute is civil in nature.

7. Since the complainants do not wish to press charges against the petitioners and there is no incriminating material against them, the chances of conviction are almost negligible.

8. Further criminal proceedings before the court and continuation of the trial would therefore be an abuse of the process of law. It will be an exercise in futility and wasteful expense of public exchequer, especially where the parties have amicably settled their dispute which does not involve any public



interest or interest of the society at large. Reference in this context may also be made to judgment rendered in the case of ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

9. The instant petition is thus allowed. The criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No. 153/2018, dated 24.04.2018, registered under Section 63 of Copyright Act, 1957 and Sections 103/104 of Trade Marks Act, 1999 at Police Station Nabi Karim, under Sections 324 and 34 of IPC against the petitioner and further proceedings arising therefrom are hereby quashed.

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

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 9, 2025/kd