



\$~62, 63, 65 & 66

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7322/2025 & CRL.M.A. 30720/2025,**
CRL.M.A. 30721/2025

GAURAV ANAND & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sanjay Abbot, Mr.
Ayush Aggarwal & Ms.
Sanjana Mishra, Advs.
along with petitioners.

versus

STATE OF GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP
for the State.
SI Vinay, PS Lajpat
Nagar.
Mr. Kunwar Karan Singh,
Mr. Shekhar Mann, Mr.
Rubal Mongia & Ms.
Yashika Aneja, Advs. for
R-2 to R-4 along with R-2
to R-4.

63

+ **CRL.M.C. 7364/2025 & CRL.M.A. 30904/2025,**
CRL.M.A. 30905/2025

AMAN PREET SINGH & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kunwar Karan Singh,
Mr. Shekhar Mann, Mr.
Rubal Mongia & Ms.
Yashika Aneja, Advs.
along with petitioners.

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP
for the State.
SI Vinay, PS Lajpat
Nagar.



Mr. Sanjay Abbot, Mr.
Ayush Aggarwal & Ms.
Sanjana Mishra, Advs.
along with R-2.

65

+

CRL.M.C. 7370/2025 & CRL.M.A. 30930/2025,
CRL.M.A. 30931/2025

HARJEET SINGH SHEEN & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kunwar Karan Singh,
Mr. Shekhar Mann, Mr.
Rubal Mongia & Ms.
Yashika Aneja, Advs. with
petitioners.

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP
for the State.
SI Vinay, PS Lajpat
Nagar.
Mr. Sanjay Abbot, Mr.
Ayush Aggarwal & Ms.
Sanjana Mishra, Advs. for
R-2 & R-3 along with R-2
& R-3.

66

+

CRL.M.C. 7372/2025 & CRL.M.A. 30935/2025,
CRL.M.A. 30936/2025

PRIYANKA BATRA & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sanjay Abbot, Mr.
Ayush Aggarwal & Ms.
Sanjana Mishra, Advs.
with petitioners.

versus

STATE OF GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Priyanka Dalal, APP
for the State.
SI Vinay, PS Lajpat



Nagar.
Mr. Kunwar Karan Singh,
Mr. Shekhar Mann, Mr.
Rubal Mongia & Ms.
Yashika Aneja, Advs. for
R-2 to R-4 along with R-2
to R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER

16.10.2025

%

1. The present petitions are respectively filed seeking quashing of the following FIRs, including all consequential proceedings arising therefrom:

- a. FIR No. 466/2025 dated 14.09.2025, registered at Police Station Lajpat Nagar, for offences under Sections 109(1)/115(2)/74/351(3)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS');
- b. FIR No. 139/2025 dated 21.02.2025, registered at Police Station Lajpat Nagar, for offence under Section 79 of the BNS;
- c. FIR No. 123/2025 dated 03.02.2025, registered at Police Station Lajpat Nagar, for offences under Sections 324(5)/351(2)/3(5) of the BNS;
- d. FIR No. 445/2025 dated 05.09.2025, registered at Police Station Lajpat Nagar, for offences under Sections 118(2)/120(2)/124/79/351(2)/61(2) of the BNS respectively.

2. It is stated that chargesheets have not been filed in the present cases.

3. It is alleged that owing to some misunderstandings in



relation to some parking issues as well as property disputes, altercations took place between the parties, who are stated to be relatives and residing in the same society. The same led to the registration of the cross-FIRs. Certain allegations in regard to misbehaviour, intimidation and injuries being inflicted have been made in the FIRs.

4. The learned counsel for the parties submit that the present FIRs were filed on account of altercations that arose out of heated arguments between the parties due to some trivial issues, and the matters have since been settled.

5. The present petitions are filed on the ground that the parties have settled all their disputes by way of Memorandum of Understanding / Settlement dated 20.09.2025 of their free will without any undue influence, coercion or misrepresentation.

6. The parties are present in person in Court today and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

7. The respective victims state that they have settled all their grievances and they do not wish to pursue the proceedings arising out of the FIRs. They further state that they have no objection if the respective FIRs and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

8. The parties submit that they wish to live peacefully and undertake to not indulge in such activities in the future.

9. The parties are bound to the said undertaking.

10. Offences under Sections 115(2)/79/351(2)/351(3) of the BNS are compoundable in nature whereas offences under Sections 324(5)/109(1)/74/118(2)/120(2)/124/61(2) of the BNS are non-compoundable in nature.



11. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') (*erstwhile* Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) can quash offences which are non-compoundable on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant. The Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down parameters and guidelines for High Court while accepting settlement and quashing the proceedings. In the case of **Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr. : (2014) 6 SCC 466**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had observed as under :

"29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1. Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

- (i) ends of justice, or*
- (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.*

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in



nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases.”

(emphasis supplied)

12. Similarly, in the case of ***Parbatbhai Aahir & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Anr. : (2017) 9 SCC 641***, the Hon’ble Supreme Court had observed as under :-

“16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the



exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

*16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. **Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.***

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and

16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”

(emphasis supplied)



13. It is not in doubt that some of the alleged offences, including the offences under Sections 74 and 124 of the BNS, are grave in nature. Offences of such nature cannot be quashed merely because the victims have settled the dispute.

14. The present case, however, seems to have been registered due to scuffles between the parties. The parties are relative and it is stated that the incidents took place due to misunderstandings and persisting petty disputes. The respective victims have categorically stated that they have no remaining grievance and expressed that they do not wish to proceed with the respective cross FIRs. In the peculiar circumstances of this case, it is unlikely that the present cross FIRs will result in a conviction when the victims do not wish to pursue the cases.

15. In such circumstances, the continuation of the proceedings would only cause ill will to fester between the parties and undue harassment, especially since the parties have now settled their disputes and have decided to live their lives peacefully in the future.

16. Keeping in view the fact that the parties have amicably entered into a settlement, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the dispute alive and continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of Court. I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS.

17. However, keeping in mind the fact that the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

18. In view of the above, FIR No. 466/2025 and all



consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to the payment of total cost of ₹60,000/- by the petitioners (in CRL.M.C. 7322/2025) to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of eight weeks from date.

19. Similarly, FIR No. 139/2025 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to the payment of total cost of ₹20,000/- by the petitioners (in CRL.M.C. 7364/2025) to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of eight weeks from date.

20. FIR No. 123/2025 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to the payment of total cost of ₹50,000/- by the petitioners (in CRL.M.C. 7370/2025) to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of eight weeks from date.

21. FIR No. 445/2025 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to the payment of total cost of ₹50,000/- by the petitioners (in CRL.M.C. 7372/2025) to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society within a period of eight weeks from date.

22. Let the proof of deposit of costs be furnished to the concerned SHO.

23. The present petitions are allowed in aforesaid terms. Pending application(s) also stand disposed of.

24. A copy of this order be placed in all the matters.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

OCTOBER 16, 2025

“SK”