



\$~62

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 6481/2025**

MR. CHANDER PRAKASHPetitioner
Through: **Mr.S.K.Mahla, Advocate**

versus

STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents
Through: **Mr.Digam Singh Dagar, APP for**
State with SI Satish Kumar, PS
Mangolpuri and SI Narender
Complainant in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

% **22.09.2025**

1. Petitioner herein seeks quashing of an FIR No.398/2016 dated 29.02.2016 for the alleged offences under Sections 354D of the IPC, registered at Police Station Mangol Puri and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.
2. Per the FIR, the complainant/Respondent no.2 alleged that she received repeated, unsolicited WhatsApp messages and calls from the petitioner. Despite being told not to contact her, the petitioner continued messaging and calling her, causing mental distress and prompting her to file a police complaint.
3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties live in the same locality and are neighbours and in order to maintain cordial relations, peace and harmony between them, with the intervention of near and dears,



have amicably resolved their disputes *vide* MOU/Compromise Deed dated 19.08.2025 which is placed on record as Annexure 'C'. He further submits that an affidavit of no objection to the quashing, deposited by respondent no. 2, has also been placed on record.

3.1 Learned Counsel further submits that keeping in view that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and differences with respect to the present case which arose due to some serious misunderstanding, further continuation of the proceedings would be a futile exercise. Thus, in order to secure the ends of justice, the interference of this Court is warranted and the FIR as well as all consequential proceedings be quashed.

4. The learned APP for the State in the petition, under instructions concur with the factum of compromise between the parties and the same has been duly verified, he informs.

5. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsels for the parties and have perused the case file.

6. The parties are present in Court, and I have interacted with them. Upon a query put to the complainant *qua* the settlement, she unequivocally states that the matter has been settled by her of her own volition, without any undue pressure or coercion from any quarter. She further submits that she regrets having levelled the allegations against the Petitioner, due to some serious misunderstanding in heat of the moment and she was not aware of the adverse consequences thereof. She further states that, in view of the settlement, she does not wish to press any charges against the petitioner and would prefer to maintain mutual cordiality rather than hostility, they are well known to each other. With the intervention of well wishers, they have now settled their dispute amicably *vide* settlement agreement dated 19.08.2025.



She states that she has now realised that the intent of the petitioner was in no manner to outrage her modesty.

7. Having heard and examined the nature of the dispute, even otherwise, *prima facie*, it appears that the matter is purely private and personal, relating to a family dispute arising from misunderstandings between the parties.

8. 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. In light thereof, I am of the view that the petition deserves to be allowed on that count as well.

9. Be that as it may, since the Complainant/Respondent no.2 does not wish to press charge against the petitioner, and there is no incriminating material against them, coupled with the fact that the parties have amicably compromised the matter, further criminal proceedings would amount to an abuse of the process of law.

10. Given that the dispute, which seems to be arising out of unnecessary differences between neighbours, has been resolved, continuing with criminal proceedings may serve no useful purpose. It would be a drain on judicial resources and abuse of the process of law, especially when dispute does not involve any public interest or interest of the society at large. Continuation of the proceedings, on the other hand, may result in hostility between the parties and defeat the very purpose of the settlement.

11. Quashing the FIRs would rather facilitate the parties in maintaining or restoring cordiality and bonhomie between the neighbours. Therefore, the proceedings deserve to be quashed in the exercise of the inherent powers of the Court. Reference may be had to the judgement rendered in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]*** in this context.



12. Accordingly, invoking inherent powers vested with this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS, it is therefore deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question to prevent undue hardship to the parties and promote mutual goodwill and societal harmony.

13. Consequently, the instant petition is thus allowed. FIR No.398/2016 dated 29.02.2016 for the alleged offences under Sections 354D of the IPC, registered at Police Station Mangol Puri along with all consequential proceedings arising there from, are hereby quashed.

14. The petition, along with pending application(s), if any, stands allowed, as above.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025/SV