



\$~74

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 878/2025**

BHARAT MEHTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr.Arshan Ahmad, Advocate

versus

STATE THROUGH SHO PS KNK MARG & ORS.....Respondents

Through: Mr.Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State

Mr. Ravi Kumar, Advocate for R-1 &
2 alongwith complainant (Through
VC)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

21.07.2025

%

1. Petitioner herein, inter alia, seeks compromise quashing of FIR No. 349/2020 registered at Police Station KNK Marg, Delhi, under Sections 323/341/354/354D/506/509 IPC, as well as the consequential proceedings arising there from. It is stated that all disputes between the parties have been amicably resolved and continuation of the further proceedings would serve no useful purpose.

2. The complainant/victim Respondent No.2, (identity masked as R) submitted a written complaint against the petitioner/accused Bharat Mehta alleging assault, verbal abuse, threatening and stalking. Based on the said complaint the FIR in question was registered and investigation ensued. Charge sheet was filed and learned M.M. took cognizance thereof and the trial is at nascent stage. Pertinently, parties were previously residing in the



same locality in Rohini, but later the petitioner and his family shifted to Pitampura, Delhi.

3. Meanwhile, with the support of their families, private parties have amicably resolved all disputes and grievances amongst themselves. They are present (R is now a resident of British Columbia, Canada and is present through video conferencing along with her counsel). They have stated before this Court to the effect that they have no objection to the quashing of the said FIR. The Complainant/victim (Respondent No.2) is presently pursuing a course at Sprott Shaw College, Burnaby, British Columbia. Instant petition is being filed by the petitioner along with the settlement deed dated 02.05.2024, signed by respondent No.2 (R-complainant/victim) and respondent No.3, Kush Gulati (brother of the respondent.2), which is appended as Annexure P-7.

4. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsel for the petitioner and respondents as well perused the material available on record.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner/accused (aged 26 years as per Aadhar Card, Annexure P-9), respondent No.2 (complainant/victim, aged 26 years as per Aadhar Card, Annexure P-11), and respondent No.3 (brother of respondent no.2, aged 21 years as per Aadhar Card, Annexure P-11) are young individuals. They are the career building stage of their life, focused on their future planning and personal growth. The petitioner has just about completed his graduation from Subharti University, Meerut. He intends to pursue higher studies in a reputed institution in the next academic session. Respondent No.2 is currently studying at Sprott Shaw College, Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada.

5.1 Learned counsel further submits that the disputes which led to



registration of FIR No. 349/2020 have been amicably resolved without any monetary exchange. Respondents No. 2 and 3 have voluntarily and unequivocally agreed to the quashing of the said FIR and have no objection to the same. Their consent has been given freely, without any coercion or undue influence.

5.2 It is contended that continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would cause undue hardship to all parties and their families. Therefore, in view of the amicable settlement and in the interest of justice, the FIR and all consequential proceedings be quashed.

6. Having heard, and seen the settlement deed dated 02.05.2024 and the undertakings of respondent No.2 (complainant/victim) and respondent No.3 (brother of respondent no.2), it appears that the disputes between the parties arose out of personal discord due to some misunderstanding perceptions. They have now been amicably resolved. From the record, it appears that the complainant/victim has no objection to the quashing of FIR in question and has consented voluntarily and not induced by any coercion or undue influence. The settlement deed submitted in Court has been signed voluntarily by all parties, and reflects a fair and lawful compromise.

7. The alleged offences are of a private nature and do not have a significant bearing on public interest or public order. Therefore, allowing the proceedings to continue would unnecessarily burden the judicial system and amount to an abuse of the process of law. Continuing the prosecution despite the complainant's stand would serve no constructive purpose and may instead lead to unnecessary hardship to the parties to settlement. Allowing the matter to linger would only rekindle tensions and hinder the process of healing between the parties.



8. As the matter does not involve any serious or heinous offence and continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose, particularly when the parties have resolved their differences and wish to move on with their lives, this Court finds it appropriate to exercise its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS to secure the ends of justice. In this context, reference may be had to guidelines laid down in Supreme Court judgment rendered in *Gian Singh v/s State* 2012 (10) SCC 303.

9. Accordingly, the petition is allowed. FIR No. 349/2020 registered at Police Station KNK Marg, Delhi, under Sections 323/341/354/354D/506/509 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising there from, including those pending before the Court of Ms. Preeti-I, Ld. Metropolitan Magistrate, Mahila Court-01, Rohini Courts, Delhi, are hereby quashed, subject to the costs of Rs. 10,000/- to be deposited by the petitioner with the Delhi State Legal Services Authority.

10. Pending application(s), if any, stand disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

JULY 21, 2025/dy