



\$~107

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

+ CRL.M.C. 8645/2025

GURPREET SINGH @ ROBIN @ RAVINDER PAL SINGH

.....Petitioner
Through: Mr. Piyush Nagpal, Ms. Aakansha
Bhardwaj, Advs. with petitioner in
person.
versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents
Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP for State
with SI Bhupender Singh PS Karol
Bagh.
Mr. Ankit Tyagi, Adv. for R-2.
R-2 (through VC).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER
% **04.12.2025**

CRL.M.A. 36116/2025 (exemption)

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

CRL.M.C. 8645/2025

3. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS seeking quashing of FIR No. 136/2011 under Sections 419/420/468/471/511 IPC registered at PS Karol Bagh.
4. Issue notice. Mr. Tarang Srivastava, learned APP for State accepts notice.



5. The petitioner is present in Court, whereas respondent no. 2 has joined through VC. The parties have been identified by their respective counsels as well as by the Investigating Officer, SI Bhupender Singh PS Karol Bagh.

6. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, by impersonating himself cheated respondent no.2/complainant.

7. However, during pendency of the proceedings, due to the intervention of friends, respectable persons and other family members, the parties have amicably resolved their disputes and arrived at a settlement, the terms whereof have been reduced in writing in the compromise deed, which is annexed as Annexure-P-3 to the present petition.

8. On a query posed by the Court, respondent no.2, who has joined through VC, affirms the factum of settlement and states he has no objection in case the FIR in question is quashed.

9. He further informs this Court that he has entered into this settlement on humanitarian ground as the petitioner has now suffered permanent disability and is wheelchair bound. Further, the petitioner remains on Oxygen support for a considerable period during the day.

10. At this stage, it would be apt 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.”

11. 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.
12. It is, thus, in the interest of justice that the present FIR and all the other proceedings emanating therefrom be quashed.
13. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 136/2011 under Sections 419/420/468/471/511 IPC registered at PS Karol Bagh alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, is quashed.
14. The petition stands disposed of in the above terms.

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 4, 2025
N.S. ASWAL