



\$~90

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

+ CRL.M.C. 8262/2025 and CRL.M.A. 34450/2025 and CRL.M.A.
34451/2025

PAWAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Kuldeep Rana, Advocate.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for State
with SI Udit, PS-Ranhola.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

20.11.2025

CRL.M.A. 34450/2025

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

CRL.M.A. 34451/2025

3. This is an application filed on behalf of applicant/petitioner seeking condonation of delay of 7 days in re-filing the petition.
4. For the reasons mentioned in the application, same is allowed. Delay of 7 days in re-filing the petition is condoned.
5. Application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 8262/2025

6. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner under Section 528 BNSS, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR no. 130/2021 under



Section 354/323/509/34 IPC registered at PS-Ranhola and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground that the parties have arrived at a settlement.

7. Issue notice. Ms. Richa Dhawan, learned APP for the State accepts notice.

8. The petitioner as well as, respondent no. 2, who are present in Court, have been identified by counsel for the petitioner, as well as, by the Investigating Officer SI Udit, PS-Ranhola.

9. The case of the prosecution is that the complainant was standing by the side of a vehicle on the road when two boys approached her and wanted to park their vehicle. Some arguments followed by a scuffle took place between the parties which led to the filing of the present FIR.

10. During pendency of the proceedings, parties were referred to Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, where they agreed to compound the compoundable offence and the petitioner also agreed to compensate the complainant to the extent of Rs.30,000/- towards her legal expenses.

11. Insofar as the non-compoundable offence is concerned, it was agreed between the parties that the petitioner will file a petition seeking quashing of FIR and respondent no.2/complainant shall cooperate for the same.

12. The petitioner has paid an amount of Rs.30,000/- to the complainant by way of bankers cheque bearing no. 015100 dated 19.11.2025 issued by State Bank of India towards her legal expenses, today in Court. The same is accepted and acknowledged by respondent no.2.

13. On a query posed by the Court, the respondent no.2 states that she has received the total settlement amount. She further states that she has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed.



14. 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.”

15. 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.

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

17. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR no. 130/2021 under Section 354/323/509/34 IPC registered at PS-Ranhola alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, is quashed.

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

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 20, 2025/jg