



\$~57

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

+ CRL.M.C. 6612/2025 and CRL.M.A. 27835/2025

RAJENDER PRASAD

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashwani Kumar, Advocate with
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State with SI Rajvver Singh, SI Nitin
Meena and SI Rajbir Singh, PS –
Krishna Nagar.
Mr. Ashutosh Kumar Shukla,
Advocate for respondent no. 2 with
respondent no. 2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

17.09.2025

%

1. Petitioner herein seeks quashing of an FIR No. 532/2023 dated 13.08.2023 registered at Police Station Krishna Nagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 354 and 506 of IPC, and all other consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a compromise between the parties.
2. Briefly stating, the FIR pertains to incidents in June and August 2023, during which the complainant made certain allegations against her father, the Petitioner, including inappropriate behavior, verbal altercations, and infliction of injuries, while he was under the influence of alcohol.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the Respondent no.2 is the daughter of the Petitioner, and the aforesaid FIR was registered due to a serious misunderstanding. He further submits that the parties, in order to maintain cordial relations, peace and harmony between them, with the intervention of well-wishers, have settled their dispute amicably *vide* Compromise Deed dated 18.07.2025 which is on record as Annexure 'P-2'.

3.1 Learned Counsel further submits that the Respondent no.2 in view of the compromise between the parties is not inclined to press charges against the petitioner, and no grievance whatsoever is left amongst the parties.

3.2 Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a senior citizen who is suffering from cancer, and thus in order to secure the ends of justice, keeping in view the settlement between the parties 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. Parties are present in Court. I have interacted with the complainant and she candidly submits that at the relevant time she was unhappy with the parenting being meted out to her and the fatherly touch was misunderstood by her as having undertone of sexual nature. This misunderstanding spiraled into the unsavory incident which led to the registration of the FIR. She further submits that she regrets having leveled the allegations against her own father, which was a result of serious misunderstanding, and she was not



aware of the adverse consequences thereof. She further submits that having settled the matter, she does not wish to press the charges against the petitioner.

7. Having heard the parties and examined the nature of the dispute, it is borne out that the parties have resolved their differences and arrived at a mutual compromise, desirous of restoring cordial relations. 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. 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. 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 a family dispute and have arisen from misunderstandings between the parties, 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. 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.

13. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 532/2023 dated 13.08.2023 registered at Police Station Krishna Nagar, for the offences punishable under Sections 323, 354 and 506 of IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising there from are hereby quashed.

14. The petition, along with pending application(s), if any, stands disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 17, 2025/kd