



\$~67 & 72

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6584/2025

PRINCE SAHNI & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ankit Rana, Adv.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State with WSI Priyanka, P.S.
Janakpuri.

Mr. Sunil Dalal, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Ankit Rana, Ms. Shipra Bali and Mr.
Sarthak Malhotra, Adv. for
respondents.

Mr. Mohit Malik, Adv. for R-2 & R-3

+ W.P.(CRL) 2387/2025 & CRL.M.A. 22315/2025-Exmp.

AMANDEEP SINGH GUJRAL & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mohit Malik, Adv.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT. OF NCT, DELHI) & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for the
State with WSI Priyanka, P.S.
Janakpuri.

Mr. Sunil Dalal, Sr. Adv. with Mr.
Ankit Rana, Ms. Shipra Bali and Mr.
Sarthak Malhotra, Adv.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

16.09.2025

%



1. Petitioners herein seek compromise quashing of an FIR No. 135/2025 dated 12.03.2025 for the alleged offences under Sections 115(2) (Voluntarily causing hurt), 74 (Assault or criminal force to woman with intent to outrage her modesty), 79 (Word, gesture or act intended to insult the modesty of a woman)of BNS, 2023 and the second FIR bearing no. 134/2025 dated 12.03.2025 for the alleged offences under Sections 74 (Assault or criminal force to woman with intent to outrage her modesty), 75(2) (Sexual Harassment), 115(2) (Voluntarily causing hurt), 324(3) (Mischief), 3(5) (In furtherance of common intention) of BNS and Section 8 of POCSO, both registered at Police Station Janak Puri along with all other proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.

2. Both FIRs, *ibid*, arising out of the same incident on the same date, represent a version and counter-version of the dispute. A heated altercation degenerated into an unsavoury scuffle, with each side alleging assault, intimidation, and misbehaviour against the other.

2.1 Dispute between the parties arose mainly from the matrimonial discord between the Petitioner no.1 (Husband) in CRL.M.C. 6584/2025 (also the Respondent no.2 in W.P.(CrI.) 2387/2025) and Respondent no.2 (Wife) in CRL.M.C. 6584/2025 (also the Petitioner no.2 in W.P.(CrI.) 2387/2025). The couple got married on 29.03.2009, however, due to irreconcilable differences between them, they are living separately since September 2024. Two children out of the wedlock are also born to them, presently in the care and custody of the Father (Petitioner no.1 in CRL.M.C. 6584/2025).

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners in both petitions submit that the



dispute between the parties arose due to a serious misunderstanding that led to the registration of the aforesaid two FIRs. However, the parties have now amicably settled all their disputes *vide* Compromise Agreement dated 19.03.2025, which is placed on record as Annexure 'C' in CrI.M.C. 6584/2025 and Annexure 'B' in W.P.CrI 2387/2025, respectively.

3.1 They submit that the respective respondents in both the petitions, per the terms of the compromise agreement, also do not thus wish to proceed further against the respective petitioners. They have all executed an Affidavit-cum-NOC in support of both the quashing petitions. They further submit that the parties have agreed to not file any other or further litigation pertaining to the dispute in question before any court of law.

3.2 Learned counsel lastly submit that, keeping in view that the parties have amicably settled their disputes and differences with respect to the present case, 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 FIRs as well as all consequential proceedings be quashed.

4. The learned ASC for the State in both the petitions, 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 the learned counsel for the Respondents, petitioners and the learned ASC for the state.

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. They further affirm in unison, of their own free will and without any coercion or duress that they do not wish to pursue the matter



and consent to the quashing of the FIRs in question.

7. Upon hearing the parties and examining the nature of the dispute, it is borne out that the matter is purely private and personal, arising out of a misunderstanding. 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 light thereof, I am of the view that both the petitions deserve to be allowed on that count as well.

8. Be that as it may, given that the dispute 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.

9. Quashing the FIRs would rather facilitate the parties in maintaining or restoring cordiality. 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.

10. Accordingly, exercising the inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of BNSS, it is therefore deemed appropriate to quash the FIR arising from this matrimonial dispute.

11. Consequently, the instant petitions are allowed. FIR No. 135/2025 dated 12.03.2025 for the alleged offences under Sections 115(2), 74, 79 of BNS, 2023 and the second FIR bearing no. 134/2025 dated 12.03.2025 for the alleged offences under Sections 74, 75(2), 115(2), 324(3), 3(5) of BNS



and Section 8 of POCSO, both registered at Police Station Janak Puri along with all the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

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

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 16, 2025

acm