



\$~26

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

+ CRL.M.C. 9091/2025 & CRL.M.A. 38054/2025

YOGENDER SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Himanshu Sharma, Adv.
Petitioners in persons.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State with SI Rakesh, ASI Tribhuwan
Jha.

Respondent-in-person.

Mr. Amit Baghel and Mr. Pradeep
Kumar, Advs. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

19.12.2025

%

1. This petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973²) seeks quashing of FIR No. 138/2019 dated 18th April, 2019, registered at P.S. Kanjhawala, under Sections 447/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860³, and all proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. The prosecution case emanates from the complaint of Respondent No.2/Complainant, Sanjay Vats, who alleges that on 14th May, 2018, when a water tanker had arrived on the land stated to be in his possession for watering plants, the Petitioners forcibly trespassed onto the said land. It is alleged that accused, Yogender Mathur, hurled a brick towards the tanker

¹ "BNSS"

² "CrPC"

³ "IPC"



driver with the intention of striking his head, which instead hit the driver's back when he stood up to save himself. Thereafter, the accused persons are stated to have beaten the tanker driver and robbed him of a water pipe. Upon being informed, when the complainant reached the spot, the accused allegedly abused and criminally intimidated him with threats, reiterating the same even in the presence of PCR officials. Initially, only an NCR under Section 506 IPC was lodged despite repeated representations by the complainant. Subsequently, pursuant to an order passed by the Magistrate directing registration of a case, FIR No. 138/2019 was registered. Upon completion of investigation, a charge sheet was filed, whereby the offence under Section 356 IPC was also invoked against the Petitioners.

3. The parties have settled their disputes and differences and executed a Memorandum of Understanding/Compromise Deed dated 24th June, 2024. The copy of the Deed is on record and perused by the Court. As per its terms, Respondent No. 2 has mutually resolved all disputes and differences with the Petitioners and has agreed to voluntarily give his no objection to the quashing of the subject FIR.

4. Respondent No. 2, who is present in person, duly identified by the Investigating Officer, has confirmed the settlement and expressed his unequivocal consent to the quashing of the FIR. He confirms that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily, without any pressure or coercion. The Petitioners have also joined the proceedings in person and are duly identified by the Investigating Officer. In light of the amicable resolution, the parties jointly seek quashing of the subject FIR and all proceedings arising therefrom.

5. The Court has considered the submissions of the parties. While the



offence under Section 356 IPC is non-compoundable, the offences under Sections 447 and 506 IPC are compoundable in certain cases.

6. It is well settled that in the exercise of its inherent powers under Section 482 CrPC (corresponding to Section 528 BNSS), the Court may, in appropriate cases, quash proceedings in respect of non-compoundable offences if the parties have reached a genuine settlement and no overarching public interest is adversely affected. The Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.***⁴ has held as follows:

“11. As discussed above, offence punishable under Section 186/332/353 of the IPC are non-compoundable being of serious nature, however, if the Court feels that continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in this case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored, it can order for quashing of the FIR or criminal proceedings as it is the duty of the Court to prevent continuation of unnecessary judicial process.

12. In view of the law discussed above, considering the Settlement arrived at between the parties and the statements of respondent no.1 & 2, I am of the considered opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus as continuance of proceedings arising out of the FIR in question would be an an exercise in futility.”

[Emphasis added]

7. Further, in ***Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.***,⁵ the Supreme Court held as follows:

“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

⁴ (2012) 10 SCC 303

⁵ (2014) 6 SCC 466



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.

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]

8. Although the offence under Section 356 IPC cannot be treated as strictly ‘*in personam*’, and it touches upon public concerns rather than being confined to individual grievances, the Court must also account for the practical realities of securing a conviction in the present case. The Supreme Court has consistently held that in cases where the complainant has entered into a voluntary and *bona fide* settlement, and is no longer inclined to support the prosecution, the prospect of securing a conviction becomes exceedingly remote. In such circumstances, continuing the prosecution may



not only prove futile, but would also serve no worthwhile public interest.

9. Respondent No. 2 has categorically expressed his unwillingness to pursue the matter further and has confirmed the settlement as voluntary and devoid of any coercion. Given this background, the continuation of criminal proceedings would amount to an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public resources unnecessarily.

10. Having regard to the totality of circumstances, and in view of the legal principles laid down by the Supreme Court, this Court finds the present case to be an appropriate one for exercise of jurisdiction under Section 528 BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 CrPC) to secure the ends of justice.

11. In view of the foregoing, the present petition is allowed and FIR No. 138/2019 dated 18th April, 2019, registered at P.S. Kanjhawala, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

12. However, since the State machinery was set in motion based on the impugned FIR, it is appropriate to impose costs on the Petitioners. Accordingly, all the Petitioners are directed to deposit INR 5,000/- each with the Delhi Police Welfare Fund within a period of four weeks from today. Proof of deposit to be submitted with the concerned IO within two weeks thereafter.

13. The parties shall remain bound by the terms of settlement.

14. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of along with any pending application(s).

SANJEEV NARULA, J

DECEMBER 19, 2025/ng