



\$~7

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 7773/2025 & CRL.M.A. 32543/2025**
ABRAR SAIFI & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sumit Kumar and Mr. Rupendra
Sharma, Advocates with Petitioners
present.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND AN R.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for State.
SI Pardeep, P.S. Mehrauli, Delhi.
Mr. Anees Ahamad and Mr. Nikhil,
Advocates for R-2 with Respondent
No. 2 (in-Person).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
11.11.2025

%

1. The present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973²) seeks quashing of FIR No. 605/2016 dated 03rd March, 2016³, registered under Sections 323/354/506/509/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860⁴ at P.S. Mehrauli, Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.
2. The case of the prosecution is that on 2nd March, 2016, at about 8:30 AM, while the Complainant/Respondent No. 2 was returning home and

¹ "BNSS"

² "CrPC"

³ "impugned FIR"

⁴ "IPC"



passing the residence of Mohd. Yunus (Petitioner No. 5), she was allegedly surrounded the Petitioners who assaulted her. It is alleged that the Petitioners pushed her to the ground, beat her, subjected her to indecent touching, and threatened her with dire consequences. On the basis of her written complaint and the corresponding MLCs, the impugned FIR came to be registered under Sections 323/354/506/509/34 IPC. Consequently, upon completion of investigation, a chargesheet was filed wherein Petitioners No. 1, 5 and 6 were charge-sheeted under Sections 323/354/506/509/34 IPC, and Petitioners No. 2 to 4 were charge-sheeted under Sections 323/506/34 IPC.

3. Apart from the present Petitioners, one Mohd. Yasin also an accused in the impugned FIR has since passed away and accordingly, the proceedings against him stand abated.

4. Pertinently, there is also a cross-FIR, being FIR No. 602/2016 registered under Sections 323/354/354B/509/452/34 IPC at P.S. Mehrauli, for which the parties have filed CRL.M.C. 7943/2025, seeking quashing thereof. The same is listed today before the Bench of Hon'ble Mr. Justice Amit Mahajan.

5. The parties with the intervention of common friends, colleagues and other respectable members of society, have amicably resolved their disputes. Respondent No. 2 has decided not to pursue the impugned FIR against them. A Memorandum of Understanding⁵ dated 25th October, 2025, has also been executed between the Petitioners and Respondent No. 2 to this effect.

6. A copy of the MoU has been placed on record and perused by the Court. As per its terms, Respondent No. 2 has mutually resolved all disputes and differences with the Petitioners and has agreed to voluntarily give her no



objection to the quashing of the impugned FIR.

7. Respondent No. 2, present in person, duly identified by the Investigating Officer, has unequivocally stated that she does not wish to pursue the impugned FIR proceedings. She has confirmed that her decision to settle the matter is voluntary and made without any undue influence or coercion. The Petitioners have also joined the proceedings in person and are duly identified by the Investigating Officer. In light of the amicable resolution between the parties, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR and all proceedings arising therefrom.

8. The Court has considered the submissions of the parties. While the offence under Section 354 of IPC is non-compoundable, Sections 323, 506 and 509 of IPC are compoundable in certain cases.

9. It is well settled that in the exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 CrPC (now Section 528 BNSS), the Court may, in appropriate cases, quash proceedings in respect of non-compoundable offences if the parties have reached a genuine settlement and no overarching public interest is adversely affected. The Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.**⁶ has held as follows:

“11. As discussed above, offence punishable under Section 186/332/353 of the IPC are non-compoundable being of serious nature, however, if the Court feels that continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in this case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored, it can order for quashing of the FIR or criminal proceedings as it is the duty of the Court to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process.

12. In view of the law discussed above, considering the Settlement arrived at between the parties and the statements of respondent no.1 & 2, I am of the considered opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus as continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question

⁵ “MoU”

⁶ (2012) 10 SCC 303



would be an an exercise in futility.”

[Emphasis added]

10. Further, in *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*,⁷ the Supreme Court held as follows:

“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

⁷ (2014) 6 SCC 466



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]

11. Although the offence under Section 354 of the IPC cannot be treated as strictly ‘*in personam*’, and it touches upon public concerns rather than being confined to individual grievances, the Court must also account for the practical realities of securing a conviction in the present case. The Supreme Court has consistently held that in cases where the complainant has entered into a voluntary and *bona fide* settlement, and is no longer inclined to support the prosecution, the prospect of securing a conviction becomes exceedingly remote. In such circumstances, continuing the prosecution may not only prove futile, but would also serve no worthwhile public interest.

12. The Complainant in the present case has categorically expressed her unwillingness to pursue the matter further and has confirmed the settlement as voluntary and devoid of any coercion. Given this background, the continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public resources unnecessarily. Having regard to the totality of circumstances, and in view of the legal principles laid down by the Supreme Court, this Court finds the present case to be an appropriate one for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Cr.P.C. to secure the ends of justice.

13. In view of the foregoing, the present petition is allowed and the impugned FIR No. 605/2016 registered at P.S. Mehrauli, Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom are hereby quashed.

14. However, since the State machinery was set in motion based on the impugned FIR, it is appropriate to impose costs on the Petitioners.



Accordingly, all the Petitioners are directed to deposit INR 2,500/- each with the Delhi Police Welfare Fund within a period of four weeks from today.

15. The parties shall remain bound by the terms of settlement.

16. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of along with pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

NOVEMBER 11, 2025/ab