



\$~27

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 9138/2025 & CRL.M.A. 38223/2025**
VIJAY SINGH & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Jatin Rajput, Mr. Rajesh Kumar Jha, Mr. Varun Panwar, Mr. Vinamir, Mr. Sandeep Kumar, Advocates with Petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORSRespondents
Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for the State.
Inspector Manohar Lal and SI Rajesh Kumar, P.S. Vijay Vihar.
Respondents No. 2 & 3 (in-Persons.)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
22.12.2025

%

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. 219/2024 dated 18th May, 2024, registered at P.S. Vijay Vihar, Delhi, under Sections 323 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860³ and Sections 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989⁴, and all proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. The prosecution case emanates from a complaint filed by Respondent

¹ "BNSS"

² "CrPC"

³ "IPC"

⁴ "SC/ST Act"



No. 2, wherein it is alleged that on 12th May, 2024, at about 9:40 PM, while Respondent No. 2 was present at his shop situated in the DDA Market, Sector-4, Rohini, along with his son (Respondent No. 3), the Petitioners came to the shop in an intoxicated condition and tried to take certain goods without making payment. Upon being asked to pay, the Petitioners are alleged to have abused Respondent No. 2 and his son and engaged in an altercation, during which Respondent No. 2 was allegedly pulled by his shirt. It is further alleged that a crowd gathered at the spot and, in public view, the Petitioners enquired about the caste of Respondent No. 2 and, upon being informed that he belonged to the Balmiki community, abused and humiliated him by using caste-based slurs and derogatory language, besides assaulting him and his son. On these allegations, the present FIR came to be registered.

3. The parties have settled their disputes and differences and executed a Compromise Deed-cum-Agreement dated 1st December, 2025. Copy of the Agreement is on record and perused by the Court. As per its terms, Respondents No. 2 and 3 have mutually resolved all disputes and differences with the Petitioners and have agreed to voluntarily give their no objection to the quashing of the subject FIR.

4. Respondents No. 2 and 3, who are present in person, duly identified by the Investigating Officer, have confirmed the settlement and expressed their unequivocal consent to the quashing of the FIR. They confirm that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily, without any pressure or coercion. It is further stated that the parties are neighbours and, with a view to maintain peace and harmony, have resolved all their disputes amicably. Additionally, Respondents No. 2 and 3 also disclose that a cross-FIR bearing



No. 210/2024, registered at P.S. Vijay Vihar under Sections 324/341/379/34 IPC, is pending between the parties, for which appropriate proceedings for compromise/quashing shall be initiated. The Petitioners are also present 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 carefully considered the submissions advanced and perused the material on record. Although the offence under Sections 323 IPC is compoundable in nature, however, the offences under Sections 3(1)(r) and 3(1)(s) of the SC/ST Act are non-compoundable. The Court is mindful that, as a general rule, proceedings arising under special statutes such as the SC/ST Act warrant a cautious and restrained approach, bearing in mind the legislative intent to safeguard the rights and dignity of marginalised communities. Nevertheless, it is equally well settled that in appropriate and exceptional situations, the High Court, in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 482 CrPC (corresponding to Section 528 BNSS), may quash criminal proceedings where the factual matrix discloses no real or subsisting cause for prosecution, and where such interference is necessary to secure the ends of justice.

6. On this aspect, it is apposite to rely to the decision of ***Ramawatar v. State of Madhya Pradesh***⁵, wherein the Supreme Court held as under:

“17. On the other hand, where it appears to the Court that the offence in question, although covered under the SC/ST Act, is primarily private or civil in nature, or where the alleged offence has not been committed on account of the caste of the victim, or where the continuation of the legal proceedings would be an abuse of the process of law, the Court can exercise its powers to quash the



proceedings. On similar lines, when considering a prayer for quashing on the basis of a compromise/settlement, if the Court is satisfied that the underlying objective of the Act would not be contravened or diminished even if the felony in question goes unpunished, the mere fact that the offence is covered under a "special statute" would not refrain this Court or the High Court, from exercising their respective powers under Article 142 of the Constitution or Section 482 CrPC."

7. In the present case, the dispute arises out of an incident that is alleged to have taken place on 12th May, 2024 at the shop of Respondent No.2, which escalated into a verbal altercation and scuffle between the parties, who are neighbours. The allegations, as borne out from the complaint, pertain to abuses and physical confrontation during the said incident. Respondents No. 2 and 3 have appeared before this Court and have categorically stated, both orally and through the Compromise Deed-cum-Agreement dated 1st December, 2025, that all disputes between the parties stand amicably resolved. They have affirmed that they have voluntarily agreed to the quashing of the FIR, without any pressure, coercion, or undue influence, and that they harbour no grievance against the Petitioners. The Court also takes note of the fact that a cross-FIR is pending between the parties, further indicating that the dispute was essentially personal in nature and that the parties have consciously chosen to put a quietus to the matter.

8. Having regard to the nature of the allegations, the private character of the dispute, the subsequent settlement between the parties, and the absence of any overriding public interest in the continuation of the criminal proceedings, this Court is of the considered view that allowing the prosecution to continue would amount to an abuse of the process of law and would not advance the underlying object of the SC/ST Act.



9. In view of the foregoing, the present petition is allowed and FIR No. 219/2024 dated 18th May, 2024, registered at P.S. Vijay Vihar, and all proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

10. However, since the State machinery was set in motion based on the impugned FIR, it is appropriate to impose costs on the Petitioners. Accordingly, 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 payment be deposited with the concerned IO within two weeks thereafter.

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

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

SANJEEV NARULA, J

DECEMBER 22, 2025

as