



\$~95

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

+ CRL.M.C. 8867/2025

PRIYA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Ratnesh Rajmurti, Advocate with
petitioner in person.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State with
SI Neeraj Saini, PS-Neb Sarai
Mr. Kartik Sharma, Advocate for R2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE VIKAS MAHAJAN

ORDER

%

12.12.2025

1. The present petition has been filed on behalf of the petitioner under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023 seeking quashing of FIR No. 1728/2015, under Section 308 IPC registered at PS-Neb Sarai, Delhi and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the ground that the parties have arrived at a settlement.
2. Issue notice.
3. Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned APP accepts notice on behalf of respondent no.1/State.
4. Petitioner, as well as, respondent no. 2 are present in Court and they have been identified by Mr. Ratnesh Rajmurt, counsel for petitioner, Mr. Kartik Sharma, counsel for respondent no.2, as well as, by the Investigating Officer i.e. SI Neeraj Saini, P.S. Neb Sarai, Delhi.



5. The case set out in the present petition is that the parties are stated to be neighbours and a dispute arose between them which escalated to a fight, in which respondent no.2 suffered simple injury.

6. During pendency of the proceedings, the parties have arrived at a settlement, terms whereof were reduced in writing in the form of compromise/Settlement deed dated 04.11.2025 which is annexure P-3 to the present petition. It is a term of settlement that petitioner shall compensate respondent no.2 by paying an amount of Rs.2,25,000/- for the medical expenses incurred by respondent no.2.

7. On a query posed by the Court, respondent no.2 affirms the factum of settlement and acknowledges having received the settlement amount. She also states that she does not wish to prosecute the criminal proceedings and has no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

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. 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.



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

11. Consequently, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 1728/2015, under Section 308 IPC registered at PS-Neb Sarai, Delhi alongwith all other proceedings emanating therefrom, is quashed.

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

VIKAS MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 12, 2025/jg