



\$~87-Q

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 292/2026**

ABHAY SHOKEEN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Prateek Jain and Mr. Akshay
Shokeen, Advocates with
petitioner in person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, ASC
(Criminal) with IO SI Amit
Mr. Vishal, Advocate for R-2 with
R-2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **21.04.2026**

1. The petitioner has filed this petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"] (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ["CrPC"]), seeking quashing of FIR No. 60/2025 dated 06.12.2025, registered under Sections 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, ["BNS"] at Cyber Police Station, Outer District, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.
2. The petitioner is present in person and is identified by his learned counsel, as well as by the Investigating Officer. Respondent No. 2 is also present in person, and has been identified by his learned counsel and the Investigating Officer.



3. The petitioner and respondent No. 2 were known to each other, as they were employed in the same organisation, namely ATH Support Services Pvt. Ltd., as Customer Service Executives. The impugned FIR came to be lodged at the instance of respondent No. 2, alleging that she was cheated and induced to part with a sum of Rs.1,45,000/- on account of an online financial fraud.

4. Pursuant to the order dated 28.01.2026, Mr. Yasir Rauf Ansari, Additional Standing Counsel (Criminal), has filed a status report dated 10.02.2026. As per the said report, the FIR was registered on the complaint of respondent No. 2 herein, who, in March 2025, was induced by the petitioner/accused, on the false pretext of securing employment at IGI Airport, Delhi. Acting upon such representation, respondent No. 2 transferred a sum of Rs. 1,45,000/- to the accused in his Axis Bank account; however, neither was any job provided nor was the amount returned. The investigation further reveals that the said amount was initially credited to the account of petitioner and was subsequently dispersed across multiple bank accounts.

5. Mr. Ansari, on instructions from the Investigating Officer present in Court, submits that the petitioner has no criminal antecedents and that no other complaints are pending against him. It is further submitted that the present case does not appear to involve a multi-victim cyber fraud.

6. The parties have since amicably resolved their disputes, as recorded in a Settlement Deed dated 07.01.2026. In terms of the said settlement, the petitioner has agreed to pay a sum of Rs.1,45,000/- to respondent No. 2 towards full and final settlement of all claims. It is further submitted that the petitioner has already furnished a banker's



cheque dated 05.01.2026 for the aforesaid amount.

7. Respondent No. 2 has affirmed before the Court that he has received the entire amount in terms of the settlement. Learned counsel for the parties further confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily, without any coercion, undue influence, or pressure.

8. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR.

9. The Supreme Court has clearly held that, in appropriate circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their inherent powers under Section 482 of the CrPC [corresponding to Section 528 of the BNSS], may quash criminal proceedings, including those relating to non-compoundable offences, where the parties have arrived at a genuine compromise, particularly in cases where such quashing does not adversely affect any overarching public interest.

10. Reference in this connection can be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.*¹, which held as follows:

“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. No doubt, crimes are acts which have harmful effect on the public and consist in wrongdoing that seriously endangers and threatens the well-being of the society and it is not safe to leave the crime-doer only because he and the victim have settled the dispute amicably or that the victim has been paid compensation, yet certain crimes have been made compoundable in law, with or without the permission of the court. In

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



respect of serious offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc., or other offences of mental depravity under IPC or offences of moral turpitude under special statutes, like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, the settlement between the offender and the victim can have no legal sanction at all. However, certain offences which overwhelmingly and predominantly bear civil flavour having arisen out of civil, mercantile, commercial, financial, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony, particularly relating to dowry, etc. or the family dispute, **where the wrong is basically to the victim and the offender and the victim have settled all disputes between them amicably, irrespective of the fact that such offences have not been made compoundable, the High Court may within the framework of its inherent power, quash the criminal proceeding or criminal complaint or FIR if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing the criminal proceedings, justice shall be casualty and ends of justice shall be defeated.** The above list is illustrative and not exhaustive. Each case will depend on its own facts and no hard-and-fast category can be prescribed.”²

Further, in *Narinder Singh and Ors. v. State of Punjab and Anr.*³, the Supreme Court has also laid down guidelines for High Courts while accepting settlement deeds between parties and quashing the proceedings. The relevant observations in the said decision read 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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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.”⁴

11. The present case emanates from a dispute arising out of an alleged act of cheating in the context of a financial transaction between parties known to each other, which has since been resolved amicably upon payment of the agreed monetary consideration. The dispute, in substance, bears a predominantly civil and financial character, without any discernible element of public interest or grave criminality.

12. In these circumstances, this Court is of the considered view that it would be appropriate to exercise its inherent jurisdiction. Respondent No. 2 has unequivocally affirmed the receipt of the entire settlement amount and the voluntary nature of the compromise. In light of the settlement and

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



the attendant facts, the likelihood of a successful prosecution appears remote and bleak. The continuation of the criminal proceedings pursuant to the impugned FIR would, therefore, serve no useful purpose and would amount to an unnecessary burden on judicial resources, thereby defeating the ends of justice.

13. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 60/2025 dated 06.12.2025, registered under Sections 318(4) of the BNS at Cyber Police Station, Outer District, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

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

15. The petition, accordingly, stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 21, 2026

'pv'/SD/