



\$~71

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 2997/2025 & CRL.M.A. 27765/2025-Exmp.**
RAJESH GOYAL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Suraj Prakash Sharma, Adv. with
petitioner in person

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondent

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

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER
16.09.2025

%

1. Petitioner herein seeks quashing of an FIR No. 747/2015 dated 19.06.2015 for the alleged offences under Section 365/323/34 of IPC, registered at Police Station Narela, along with any consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.

2. Per the FIR, the complainant alleges that the petitioner, along with another person abducted him to an unknown place where they assaulted him. The petitioner compelled him to sign stamp papers, took his driving license, and demanded ₹20 lakhs. The parties are in fact known to each other and were enjoying cordial relations before the dispute, which arose due to disagreement regarding a financial transaction. The FIR was registered due to a misunderstanding between the parties with respect to the said financial



transaction.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the parties have amicably settled their dispute *vide* compromise deed dated 02.09.2025 which is placed on record (**Annexure P-2**). 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 ASC 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 learned counsel for the petitioners and respondent no. 2 as well as perused the material available on record.

6. The parties are present before the Court in person. Upon interaction, it appears that the underlying dispute, being private in nature, has indeed been amicably resolved. Respondent No. 2 further affirms that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily, without any duress or coercion, and accordingly, they do not wish to pursue any charges against the petitioners.

7. Apart from the compromise between the petitioner and the complainant/respondent no. 2, even otherwise, I am of the view that there does not seem to be any incriminating material on record. The FIR was registered way back in the year 2015 and later on, after a lapse of about 10 years, the charge sheet is still stated to be under preparation.

8. Thus, continuation of criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose, constitutes an abuse of the process of law, and place an unnecessary burden on the judicial system. In contrast, quashing the FIR in question would promote peace and harmony between the parties,



particularly as the complainant does not wish to pursue the case further.

9. In view of the above, and applying the ratio laid down in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab &Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***, it is deemed just and appropriate to invoke the inherent powers of this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS to prevent undue hardship to the parties and promote mutual goodwill and societal harmony.

10. However, it is made clear that the FIR is quashed only qua the present petitioner herein and therefore, the prosecution shall be at liberty to proceed against his family members in accordance with law.

11. Accordingly, the instant petition is allowed and FIR No. 747/2015 dated 19.06.2015 for the alleged offences under Section 365/323/34 of IPC, lodged at Police Station Narela and all other consequential proceedings are hereby quashed.

12. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

acm