



\$~134

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 8562/2025**

MANISHA ISRANI

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ashok Chhaparia and Mr. Shanto Mukherjee, Advocates with petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP for State with Inspr. Satyabir, PS-EOW.
Mr. Rama Chandran Nair, AR of R2.
Respondent no.3 through VC.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

02.12.2025

CRL.M.A. 35791/2025

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

CRL.M.C. 8562/2025

3. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner under Section 528 BNSS Section 482 Cr.P.C. seeking quashing of FIR No. 34/2025 under Section 406/420/120B IPC registered at PS-EOW, Mandir Marg on the ground that parties have arrived at a settlement.
4. Issue notice.
5. Mr. Tarang Srivastava, learned APP for appearing on behalf of the



State accepts notice. He points out that in the FIR two persons have been arraigned as the accused, namely Manish Israni and Vijay Israni, whereas the present petition has been filed only on behalf of Manisha Israni. The other co-accused namely, Vijay Israni has not been impleaded as a petitioner.

6. Mr. Ashok Chhaparia, learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner herein and Vijay Israni are present in Court, whereas, Ms. Pushpa Sharma, respondent no.3 has joined through VC. Likewise, authorized representative of respondent no.2 LRSD Securities Pvt. Ltd. namely, Mr. Rama Chandran Nair is also present in Court.

7. The parties have been identified by learned counsel for the petitioner as well as, by the Investigating Officer namely Insp. Satyabir, PS-EOW.

8. The case set out in the present petition is that an FIR was registered at the instance of respondent no.2 alleging that the petitioners who are owners of property bearing no. L-24, Hauz Khas Enclave, New Delhi had entered into an agreement to sell with respondent no.2 for a total consideration of Rs.13 Cr., out of which respondent no.2 had paid Rs.12 Cr. It later transpired that the petitioners have subsequently entered into another agreement to sell with respondent no.3 with regard to the same property for a total consideration of 26.65 Cr., against which respondent no.3 paid an amount of Rs.2 Cr. Accordingly, a complaint was made by respondent no.2 which led to the registration of aforesaid FIR.

9. Sequel to above, a suit was filed by respondent no.2 in which respondent no.3 was also impleaded as defendant.

10. During pendency of the said suit, the parties were referred to the



mediation under the aegis of Delhi High Court Mediation and Conciliation Centre, where parties have arrived at settlement, terms whereof have been reduced in writing in the form of settlement agreement dated 30.05.2025, a copy of which has been annexed as Annexure P-2 to the present petition.

11. As per the terms of the settlement, the petitioner Manisha Israni and her husband Vijay Israni have agreed to pay a sum of Rs.6 Cr. to respondent no.3 and a sum of Rs.13.65 Cr. to respondent no.2. The said amounts are stated to have been paid to respondent nos. 2 and 3.

12. Mr. Ram Chandran Nair, authorized representative of respondent no.2, as well as Ms. Pushpa Sharma, respondent no.3, who has joined through VC, acknowledges having received the full and final settlement amount in terms of the settlement agreement.

13. On being queried by the Court, they state that they have no objection, in case the FIR is quashed.

14. At this stage, it will be apt to refer to the decision of the Hon'ble Supreme in ***Parbatbhai Aahir vs. State of Gujarat (2017) 9 SCC 641***, wherein it is laid down as under:-

“...16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal



proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and”...

15. The decision in ***Parbatbhai Aahir*** (supra) is squarely applicable to the facts of the present case. The dispute between the parties predominantly appears to be civil. Even otherwise, since the parties have arrived at settlement, no useful purpose will be served in continuing the criminal proceedings, 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. 34/2025 under Section 406/420/120B IPC registered at PS-EOW, Mandir Marg alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, is quashed.

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

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

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 2, 2025/jg