



\$~57

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7820/2025**

PANKAJ YADAV

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ankit Tyagi and Mr. Deepak
Kumar, Advs.

versus

STATE (N.C.T. OF DELHI) AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for State
with SI Ajit Kumar and HC Chhagan
Lal, PS. Anand Parbat.
Mr. Vishal, Adv. for R-2 to R-5.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

% **07.11.2025**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR No.251/2024 under Sections 435 IPC 1860 registered at Police Station Anand Parbat and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the ground that the parties have arrived at a settlement.
2. Issue notice. Ms. Richa Dhawan, learned APP for the State accepts notice.
3. Petitioner no.1, as well as respondent nos. 2 to 5 are present in Court and they have been identified by their respective counsel, as well as by the Investigating Officer SI Ajit Kumar and HC Chhagan Lal, PS. Anand Parbat.
4. The case of the prosecution in brief is that the present FIR came to be registered on the complaint of respondent no.2/Sanjay alleging that on 26.05.2024, four two-wheelers parked in front of Factory No. PP-45, Gali



No.10, Anand Parbat Industrial Area, Delhi were set on fire by some unknown person.

5. During the course of investigation, statements of the complainants were recorded.

6. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties with the intervention of well-wishers had arrived at a settlement, terms whereof were reduced in writing in the form of Memorandum of Understanding dated 26.04.2025, which is annexed as Annexure P/2 to the present petition.

7. It is a term of the settlement between the parties that the respondent nos. 2 to 5 have no objection in case the present FIR is quashed. The petitioner has also compensated the complainant for the alleged loss and assisted them in getting their vehicles repaired.

8. Respondent nos.2 to 5, on a query posed by the Court, affirm the factum of settlement and state that they have no objection in case the FIR is quashed.

9. At this stage, apt would it be to refer to the observations of the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab, (2012) 10 SCC 303: (SCC p. 340, para 58)***

“58. Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor.”

10. In view of the settlement between the parties, the ultimate chances of conviction in the case are bleak, therefore, continuation of criminal



proceedings will not serve any useful purpose and it will be an exercise in futility.

11. It is, thus, in the interest of justice that the present FIR and all the other proceedings emanating therefrom be quashed.

12. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.251/2024 under Sections 435 IPC 1860 registered at Police Station Anand Parbat alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, are quashed.

13. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

14. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 7, 2025/dss