



\$~79

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 6719/2025**

SUKUMAR BARUA & ANR.

Through: Ms. Supriya Manan, Adv. with
petitioners in person.Petitioner

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State with SI Shantanu, P.S. Sunlight
Colony.Respondent

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA**

% **ORDER
22.09.2025**

1. Quashing of an FIR No. 339/2022 dated 09.07.2022, registered at Police Station, Sunlight Colony under Sections 323/354/354B/506/509/34 IPC along with all proceedings arising therefrom is sought herein on the basis of a compromise deed dated 19.07.2025 executed between the parties.
2. The complainant, who belongs to the Mahawar Koli (Scheduled Caste) community, alleged that her neighbors, namely Sukumar, Malti, and Aman, assaulted her as well as her elderly mother-in-law. The accused also used caste-based abuses and molested the complainant and extended threats to her life.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the dispute between the parties arose due to a serious misunderstanding that led to the registration of the aforesaid FIRs. However, the parties have now amicably settled all their disputes *vide* Compromise Agreement dated 19.07.2025, which is placed on record as Annexure 'P-3'.

3.1 Learned counsel for the petitioners further submit that the dispute was just an altercation between neighbors arising over trivial issues concerning flowerpots and seepage. The matter has been amicably resolved between the parties.

3.2 He submits that the nature of the dispute is essentially personal and non-heinous. The allegations pertain to offences under Sections 323/354/354B/506/509/34 IPC, which, though non-compoundable, do not involve offences against the State or heinous crimes of grave moral turpitude. Continuing with the prosecution would serve no legitimate purpose and would only cause undue hardship to the Petitioners.

3.3 He submits that since the complainant herself has settled the matter and has no desire to support the prosecution, even if the trial is allowed to proceed, it would merely result in wastage of precious judicial time and cause harassment to the Petitioners.

4. The learned APP for the State 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 APP/ASC for the state.

6. The parties are present before the Court in person. The parties are stated to be well acquainted with each other and are immediate neighbors



residing in the same locality. 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. In fact, there are two cross- FIRs (FIR No. 230/2025 dated 10.06.2025 and FIR No. 339/2022 dated 09.07.2022) filed by each one of them against the family members of the other. However, subsequently, both sides seem to have settled the matter and have expressed their remorse and regret that what was a routine altercation turned into the unsavoury incident of invoking such penal provisions having harsh consequences. They do not wish to now pursue the same. They submit that they did not realise the consequences of levelling such allegations and they were not really aware as to what provisions actually will be invoked by the investigating authorities.

8. Upon hearing the parties and examining the nature of the dispute and 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 both the petitions deserve to be allowed on that count as well.

9. 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.

10. Accordingly, invoking inherent powers vested with this Court



under Section 528 of the BNSS, it is deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question. Reference in this context may also be had to judgment rendered in the case of ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

11. The instant petition is thus allowed. The criminal proceedings arising out of FIR No. 339/2022 dated 09.07.2022 for the alleged offences under Sections 323/354/354B/506/509/34 IPC registered at Police Station Sunlight Colony under Sections and further proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

12. Pending application, if any, also stands disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025

acm