



\$~57

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6418/2025 and CRL.M.A. 27097/2025

V K TIWARI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rakesh Shukla and Mr. Nitesh,
Advocate with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State with Inspector Shailendra Kr.
Singh, PS – Okhla Industrial Area,
Delhi.
Mr. Sanjay Kr. Choubey and
Mr. Tejveer Sharma, Advocates for
respondent no. 2 with respondent no.
2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

11.09.2025

%

1. Petitioner herein seeks compromise quashing of an FIR No. 105/2022 dated 19.01.2022 registered under Section 3(1)(r)(s) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 at Police Station Okhla Industrial Area and proceedings arising therefrom based on the compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. Per the FIR, the complainant states that he works in TRIFED, Union Ministry of Tribal Affairs and on 23.06.2021, the petitioner used casteist words against him and did not let the complainant enter into the premises.



3. In view of the aforesaid, I have heard the rival contentions and perused the case file.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submit that the petitioners and respondents have amicably settled their disputes by giving statement before the Ld Trial Court which has been duly recorded in the order dated 22.03.2025 (Annexure - 7).

5. The complainant is present in Court and is identified by his counsel. On being interacted with, he unreservedly admits that, at the relevant time, he failed to appreciate the grave and irreversible consequences of the allegations levelled by him under Section 3(1)(r)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989. He now realises that invoking the stringent provisions of the said special statute carried severe implications for the petitioner, both personally and professionally. He candidly concedes that his action was out of misapprehension and poor legal advice, and he has thus chosen to resolve the matter amicably. He further expresses deep regret for having unwittingly dragged the petitioner into such serious proceedings under the SC/ST Act.

6. The complainant also tenders his unconditional apology to the petitioner, which the petitioner has accepted in open Court with grace and magnanimity. The petitioner has categorically stated that, in the larger interest of maintaining peace and cordiality, he does not wish to pursue any counter-action against the complainant and would prefer to bring the matter to a quietus.

7. The parties thus jointly submit that given that they have buried the hatchet and in order to not unnecessarily nurture any hostilities in future. They wish to enjoy the mutual cordiality and bonhomie arising out of the



settlement. They submit that FIR be quashed as they do not intent to press any charges against each other.

8. Upon hearing the parties and examining the nature of the dispute, it is borne out that the FIR was lodged due misunderstanding between the parties. Even on a plain reading, and in light of the candid statements of parties, it appears doubtful whether the essential ingredients of the offences invoked under the penal provisions are satisfied. At this stage, in view of the settlement and apology tendered, the petition deserves to be allowed on that count as well.

9. The dispute, being private and personal in nature arising out of their matrimonial relationship, has since been amicably resolved, and the complainant himself does not wish to pursue the case. In these circumstances, pursuing the criminal case would serve no useful purpose, would unnecessarily burden the judicial system.

10. Thus, in the larger interest of justice, and in exercise of the inherent powers vested in this Court, it is deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question arising out of matrimonial dispute between the private parties. Reference may also be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

11. Consequently, the instant petition is allowed. The criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No. 105/2022 dated 19.01.2022 registered under Section 3(1)(r)(s) of Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989 at Police Station Okhla Industrial Area along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

12. However, before parting, this Court cannot remain oblivious to the



larger ramifications of the present case. The SC/ST Act is a special legislation, designed with a clear legislative intent to protect members of the Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes from indignities, humiliation, and atrocities. The statute is meant to operate as a shield for the vulnerable, not as a weapon for collateral or personal vendetta. The present matter is a stark example of how invocation of such stringent provisions, without adequate basis, can result in grave prejudice to an accused, tarnish reputation, and jeopardise career, particularly in cases involving government service.

13. This Court, therefore, finds it necessary to flag the issue arising there from i.e. while the protective intent of the SC/ST Act must be honoured and safeguarded, equal responsibility lies upon the prosecuting agency to ensure that FIRs under the said statute are not registered mechanically. A bare allegation, without proper verification or scrutiny, can unleash disproportionate consequences on the accused, consequences which may not be capable of full redressal even if the matter is later compromised. It is imperative that the investigating and prosecuting agencies maintain heightened caution and responsibility before setting the machinery of such a stringent statute into motion.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 11, 2025

kd