



\$~80

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 6738/2025, CRL.M.A.28402/2025, CRL.M.A. 28403/2025
ANKUR ARORAPetitioner

Through: Mr. Aditya Mayyar, Mr. Devansh Gupta, Advocates alongwith Petitioner in Person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for the State with SI Sachin Kumar, PS Amar Colony.
Ms. Tripti, Advocate for Respondent-1 & Mr. D.S. Thakur, Advocate for Respondent-2, along with R2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER
22.09.2025

%

1. Petitioner herein seeks compromised quashing of an FIR No. 612/2016 dated 10.10.2016 under Sections 342, 509, 506 and 34 IPC, registered at P.S. Amar Colony, Delhi, along with all the proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise arrived between the parties.
2. Briefly stated, the FIR pertains to a property deal between the petitioner's late father, Mr. Subhash Arora, and Respondents Nos. 2 and her brother regarding a joint property. The complainant/Respondent no.2 alleged that during a subsequent visit to Petitioner's father office for exchanging documents, the complainant and her brother, Respondent no.3 were detained for 4 hours and coerced to pay Rs. 50 lakhs in exchange of documents which led to lodging of FIR by her.
3. Learned Counsel for the Petitioners submits that the parties are well



known to each other since the property was jointly owned by the Petitioner's late father and the Respondents Nos. 2 and 3. He further submits that the FIR was registered against the Petitioner's Father who passed away on 30.09.2020. Petitioner herein was not arrayed as Accused, and no allegations have been made in the FIR.

3.1 He further submits that, with a view to preserve harmony and peace between the parties, they have amicably settled the dispute out of their own volition and without any coercion or undue influence, through a mediation process held before the mediator at the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, vide Compromise Deed dated 04.01.2020, as is borne out from Annexure P-7.

3.2 He further submits that in view of the compromise between the parties, Respondent No.2 is not inclined to press charges against the petitioner and proceed further in the matter.

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. I have interacted with the Respondent no. 2 who is present in Court. On a specific query put to her *qua* the nature of the allegations and the alleged offences involved in the FIR, she categorically submits that she regrets having made such allegations against the petitioner, as she did not quite appreciate the adverse consequences of including such Sections at the time of registration of the FIR. She further submits that having settled the matter, she does not wish to press charges against the petitioner.

7. Upon hearing the parties and examining the nature of the dispute, it is



borne out that the matter is purely private and personal. 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 as the dispute seems to be civil in nature. In light thereof, I am of the view that the petition deserves to be allowed on that count as well.

8. 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.

9. 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. 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.

11. 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.

12. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 612/2016 dated



10.10.2016 under Sections 342, 509, 506 and 34 IPC, registered at P.S. Amar Colony, Delhi, along with all consequential proceedings arising there from are hereby quashed.

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

ARUN MONGA, J

SEPTEMBER 22, 2025/rs/nk