



\$~130

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

+ CRL.M.C. 8212/2025 and CRL.M.A. 34286/2025

CHANDAN JHA & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ritik Malik, Mr. Brajeesh Kumar
and Mr. Akhil Suri, Advocates.

Versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP for
State with Inspr. Kishore Kumar, PS-
Vasant Kunj North.
Mr. Neeraj Gupta, Advocate for R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

19.11.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 482 of Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No.373/2023 under Section 408/468/471, registered at Police Station Vasant Kunj North and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground that the parties have arrived at a settlement.
2. Issue notice. Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, learned APP for the State accepts notice
3. The petitioners as well as Mr. Pankaj Isshar, AR of respondent no.2/company are present in Court. They have been identified by their respective counsels as well as by the Investigating Officer (IO) Kishore Kumar, PS-Vasant Kunj North.



4. The case of the prosecution as articulated in the present petition is that an FIR was registered at the instance of respondent no.2/company alleging that the petitioner no.1, who was working for respondent no.2/company siphoned off funds of the company along with his family members to the tune of Rs.4,28,44,427/-.

5. During pendency of the proceedings, parties have resolved all their disputes amicably without any coercion or pressure and arrived at a settlement, terms whereof have been reduced in writing in the Memorandum of Understanding dated 03.07.2024, which is annexed at Annexure P-6 (Colly) to the present petition. In terms of the settlement, petitioners have agreed to pay a sum of Rs.3,50,00,000/- towards full and final settlement to the respondent No.2/company.

6. On being queried by the Court, Mr. Isshar states that company has settled the matter with the petitioners. He acknowledges the receipt of entire settlement amount and submits that respondent no.2 does not wish to prosecute the criminal proceedings any further. Therefore, respondent No.2 has no objection, in case the FIR in question is quashed.

7. In view of the fact that no government agency is involved and the petitioners as well as respondent no.2 have amicably settled their disputes, 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.

8. 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.”

9. It is, thus, in the interest of justice that the present FIR and all the other proceedings emanating therefrom be quashed.
10. However, considering that the police machinery was put into motion and judicial time has been wasted, cost of Rs.50,000/- is imposed on the petitioners.
11. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No.373/2023 under Section 408/420/467/468/471/ 120B, registered at Police Station Vasant Kunj alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, is quashed subject to petitioners together depositing cost of Rs.50,000/- in the Delhi High Court Staff Welfare Fund, Account No. 15530110074442, Bank and Branch: UCO Bank, Delhi High Court within 10 days. The receipt thereof be placed on record.
12. In the event the cost is not paid, Registry is directed to list the matter after two weeks.
13. The petition along with pending application stands disposed of in the above terms.
14. Order be uploaded on the website of this Court.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 19, 2025/jg