



\$~96

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 6386/2025 & CRL.M.A. 26985/2025 EXMP**
RAJEEV KUMAR & ANR.

.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Vishnu Kant Pandey and Mr.
Keshav Sharma, Advs.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondent
Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State.
R-2 in person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

% **ORDER**
10.09.2025

CRL.M.A. 26985/2025 (Exemption)

Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 6386/2025

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No. 865/2006 dated 17.11.2006 under Sections 452/323/506/34 IPC registered at Police Station Gokalpuri, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise between the parties.
2. The complainant alleged that the petitioners forcefully entered



complainant's house, abused and threatened and even assaulted her.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties are known to each other and with the intervention of well-wishers, they have settled their dispute amicably vide compromise deed dated 02.08.2025 which is on record (**Annexure P-3**). He further submits that an affidavit of no objection to the quashing, deposed by respondent no. 2, has also been placed on record.

4. Both the counsel for Respondent No. 2 and the learned APP for the State concur with the factum of the compromise arrived between the parties and convey their no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard the counsel for the petitioners and interacted with the complainant who is present in Court.

6. Respondent no.2 is present in Court, and I have interacted with her. Upon a query put to her *qua* the settlement, she unequivocally states that the matter has been settled on her own volition, without any undue pressure or coercion. The complainant submits that she has already forgiven the petitioners and she is no more interested to continue the present case against the petitioners.

7. It appears that the parties have resolved their differences and arrived at a mutual compromise, desirous to restore cordial relations.

8. Having interacted with the complainant and given that it seems to be a matter of family and neighbourhood not involving either any public interest or any societal interest, it would be an exercise in futility to continue with the further criminal proceedings, as the same would be nothing but abuse of the process of law apart from being a burden on the judicial system as well as wasteful expenditure of the public by the prosecution.



9. Quashing of FIR would prevent undue hardship to the parties and promote mutual goodwill and societal harmony. Continuation of the proceedings, on the other hand, may result in hostility between the parties and defeat the very purpose of the settlement, particularly when the complainant himself does not wish to pursue the case.

10. Taking a wholesome view, it is thus a fit case to exercise inherent power under 528 of BNSS in quashing the FIR in question. Reference in this context may also be made to the judgment in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr., [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

11. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.865/2006 dated 17.11.2006 registered at Police Station Gokalpuri, for the offences punishable under Sections 452/323/506/34 IPC along with all consequential proceedings arising there from are hereby quashed.

12. The petition, along with pending applications, if any, stands disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 10, 2025

acm