



\$~89

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3054/2025  
MAMTA & ORS.**

.....Petitioner  
Through: Mr. Prateek, Adv with petitioners in  
person.

versus

**STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.**

.....Respondent  
Through: Mr. Anand V. Khatri, ASC for State  
with W/SI Pooja, P.S. Sunlight  
Colony.  
Respondent no. 3 along with her  
parents.

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

**ORDER  
22.09.2025**

%

1. Quashing of an FIR No. 230/2025 dated 10.06.2025 registered at Police Station Sunlight Colony under Sections 78, 79 and 3(5) BNS r/w Section 12 of the POCSO Act 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, a minor student, alleged that her neighbour Mamta Koli, with Bunty and Hitesh, body-shamed, stalked, and harassed her with obscene remarks and gestures.



3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the dispute between the parties arose due to a misunderstanding that led to the registration of the aforesaid FIR. However, the parties have now amicably settled all their disputes *vide* Compromise Agreement dated 19.07.2025, which is placed on record as Annexure 'P2'.

3.1 Learned counsel lastly submit that, the object of criminal law is not to perpetuate hostility between neighbours but to ensure justice. Once the underlying dispute has been settled, insisting on prosecution would defeat the very purpose of justice.

3.2 Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the possibility of conviction of the petitioners is extremely remote and bleak. The allegations in the FIR primarily arose out of neighbourhood misunderstandings rather than any deliberate criminal intent. The complainant no longer wishes to press charges. If the trial is permitted to continue, it will result in unnecessary harassment of the petitioners and wastage of valuable judicial time.

4. The learned ASC 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. Upon interaction with complainant, 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. The parents of the victim/R-3 are present and so is the victim. On a Court query put to them, they submit that as there was some miscommunication between the victim and the parents which was misunderstood leading to the impression that there was sexual overtone on the conduct of the accused which subsequently was found to be merely innocent comment on their daughter and they regret having invoked the stringent provisions of POCSO. They, therefore, do not press the FIR any further.

7.1 On a query put to the victim who seems to be well aware of her rights and an educated young girl of 17 years. She states that she had not intended to invoke the provisions of POCSO and there were no such allegations. There was completed misunderstanding between accused and her parents which led to registration of the FIR.

8. The parties are stated to be well acquainted with each other and are immediate neighbours residing in the same locality. 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. At this stage, in light thereof, I am of the view that both the petitions deserve to be allowed on that count as well.

8.1 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. 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.

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. 230/2025 dated 10.06.2025 registered at Police Station Sunlight Colony under Sections 78, 79 and 3(5) BNSS r/w Section 12 of the POCSO Act and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

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

**ARUN MONGA, J**

**SEPTEMBER 22, 2025/acm**