$~91

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

% ***Date of Decision: December 16, 2025***

\+ **W.P.(CRL) 4164/2025 & CRL.M.A. 37548/2025**

PARVESH & ANR. .....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sachin Dabas, Advocate along with petitioners in person.

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR. .....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC for the State with Mr. Alok Sharma, Advocate.
Insp. Sunil Kumar, PS Lodhi Colony.
SI Prajjwal, PS Prem Nagar.
Mr. Harsh Sharma, Advocate for complainant along with complainant in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

AMIT MAHAJAN, J. *(Oral)*

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 551/2021 dated 05.08.2021, registered at Police Station Prem Nagar, for offences under Sections 356/379/452/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('**IPC**') including all the proceedings emanating therefrom. Chargesheet has been filed in the present

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:DEEPANSHU
Signing Date:17.12.2025
15:22:07

case.

2. It is alleged that on 05.08.2021, at about 7-7:30 PM, the Petitioners entered the House of the Respondent No. 2/Complainant, when an altercation took place between the parties and the Petitioners started beating her and her son Manish. They then snatched one earring and a gold chain weighing 1.5 tola (about 10.5 grams) of Respondent no. 2 and ran away. Hence, the subject FIR was registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties are related to each other.

4. The present petition is filed on the ground that the parties have amicably settled their disputes by way of Memorandum of Understanding dated 19.09.2025, on their own free will, without any coercion, undue influence, pressure or threat.

5. The parties are present in person in Court and they have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer.

6. On being asked, Respondent No. 2 states that she has settled all the disputes and there is no remaining grievance against the petitioners. She states that she does not wish to pursue any proceeding arising out of the present FIR, has no objection if the same is quashed and continuation of proceedings would cause undue harassment of the parties.

7. Petitioners undertake not to indulge in any such activity in future. They state that the parties being related to each other, have decided to bury their disputes and live peacefully in future.

8. Offences under Sections 379 of the IPC is compoundable in nature and offences under Sections 356/452 of the IPC are

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:DEEPANSHU
Signing Date:17.12.2025
15:22:07

non-compoundable.

9. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') (erstwhile Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) can quash offences which are non-compoundable under the Code on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant. The Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down parameters and guidelines for High Court while accepting settlement and quashing the proceedings. In the case of ***Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.*** **: (2014) 6 SCC 466**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had observed as under :-

> *"**29.** In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:*
>
> ***29.1.** Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.*
>
> ***29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:***
>
> ***(i) ends of justice, or***
>
> ***(ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.***
>
> ***While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.***

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:DEEPANSHU
Signing Date:17.12.2025
15:22:07

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. *On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.*

29.5. *While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases."*

(emphasis supplied)

10. Similarly, in the case of ***Parbatbhai Aahir & Ors. v. State of Gujarat & Anr.*** **: (2017) 9 SCC 641**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had observed as under :-

"16. *The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:*

16.1. *Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.*

16.2. *The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. While compounding an offence, the power of*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:DEEPANSHU
Signing Date:17.12.2025
15:22:07

the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. *In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.*

16.4. *While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.*

16.5. *The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.*

16.6. *In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence.* ***Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.***

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*

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:DEEPANSHU
Signing Date:17.12.2025
15:22:07

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

16.10. *There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance."*

(emphasis supplied)

11. In the present case, the dispute is essentially private in nature and has arisen between related parties.The complainant has stated that she has no remaining grievance against the Petitioners and she is satisfied with the settlement so arrived between them. In the peculiar circumstances of this case, it is unlikely that the present FIR will result in a conviction when complainant/Respondent No. 2 does not wish to pursue the case. In such circumstances, Continuation of the criminal proceedings, despite such settlement, would only rekindle familial discord, cause unnecessary harassment to the parties, and result in wastage of valuable judicial time.

12. Keeping in view the nature of dispute and the fact that the parties have amicably settled the dispute, this Court feels that no useful purpose would be served by keeping the dispute alive and continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of the process of Court. I am of the considered opinion that it is a fit case to exercise discretionary jurisdiction under Section 528 of

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:DEEPANSHU
Signing Date:17.12.2025
15:22:07

the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') (erstwhile Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973).

13. However, keeping in mind the fact that the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

14. In view of the above, FIR No. 551/2021 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of total cost of ₹50,000/- by petitioners, to be deposited with the Delhi Police Martyrs' Fund, within a period of eight weeks from date.

15. Proof of deposit of cost be submitted to the concerned SHO.

16. The present petition is allowed in aforesaid terms. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

DECEMBER 16, 2025
DU

Signature Not Verified
Signed By:DEEPANSHU
Signing Date:17.12.2025
15:22:07