



\$~57

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 8058/2025**

KRISHNA PAL SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Pranay Sharma and Mr. Vipin,
Advocates with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for
State with SI Nitesh Singh, PS-
Mukherjee Nagar.
Respondents in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

14.11.2025

CRL.M.A. 33672/2025

1. Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. Application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 8058/2025 and CRL.M.A. 33671/2025

3. The present petition has been filed on behalf of petitioner under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR No. 774/2017 under Section 365 IPC registered at PS-Mukherjee Nagar on the ground that parties have resolved their differences amicably.
4. Petitioner, as well as, respondents, are present in Court and they have been identified by learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner, as well as, by SI Nitesh Singh, PS Mukherjee Nagar.
5. The case set out in the present petition is that the respondent no.2/complainant had made a complaint with regard to abduction of respondent no.3 (complainant's daughter) on the basis of which present FIR



came to be registered.

6. It is stated that the petitioner and respondent no.3 were known to each other and both preparing for competitive examination in July, 2017. However, complainant without verifying the fact got the complaint registered.

7. Mr. Pranay Sharma, learned counsel appearing on behalf of petitioner submits that till date the chargesheet has not been filed, which fact is also verified by Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, learned APP for State, on instructions from the IO, who is present in Court.

8. He further submits that petitioner is pursuing Ph.D. whereas respondent no.3 is now Sub-Inspector in BSF posted in Jammu and Kashmir.

9. Complainant who is present in Court, on a query posed by the Court, states that he was residing in village and on account of some communication gap between him and his daughter/respondent no.3, the complaint was made by him which led to the registration of FIR.

10. Respondent no.3 is also present in Court. On being queried by the Court, she also states, she does not want to prosecute the criminal proceedings.

11. In view of the fact that petitioner as well as respondent no.3 were known to each other, as they were together preparing for competitive examination and regard being had to the statement made by the complainant as well as respondent no.3, this Court is of the view that no useful purpose will be served in continuation of criminal proceedings and it will be an exercise in futility.

12. 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.”

13. It is, thus, in the interest of justice the present FIR and all the other proceedings emanating therefrom be quashed.
14. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 774/2017 under Section 365 IPC 1860 registered at Police Station Mukherjee Nagar, Delhi alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, are quashed.
15. The petition alongwith pending application stands disposed of in the above terms.
16. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 14, 2025/jg