



\$~24

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1454/2026, CRL.M.A. 5853/2026

ANUJ SINGH

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Chirag Khurana, Mr. Nitin Arora,
Ms. Diksha Gogia and Mr. Mohit
Chawala, Advocates alongwith
petitioner.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Ms. Richa Dhawan, APP for State.
SI Shweta, P.S. Subzi Mandi.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER

13.03.2026

%

By way of the present petition filed under section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 2023, the petitioner seeks quashing of case FIR No. 359/2025 dated 28.07.2025 registered under sections 75/79 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ('BNS') and section 12 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offence Act, 2012 ('POCSO Act') at P.S.: Subzi Mandi, North Delhi. Consequent upon completion of investigation, offences under sections 78 of the BNS and 12 of the POCSO Act have been alleged *vide* charge-sheet dated 16.10.2025.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he had been 'watching' the victim for over 3-4 days, while the latter went to go to fetch milk from the local mother dairy. The petitioner is stated to have told the victim that he liked her. However, there are no allegations of any physical



engagement by the petitioner with the victim. Accordingly, neither has any evidence pertaining to the same come through in the chargesheet.

3. The victim was about 16½ years of age at the relevant time; and the petitioner was about 21 years old.
4. The victim is present in court alongwith her mother. The court has interacted with them. The mother states that the incident was a one of occurrence; that the petitioner did not pursue or stalk the victim, except on one occasion when he was duly berated and reprimanded, whereafter he did not persist in any unseemly act.
5. The allegations against the petitioner are under section 12 of the POCSO Act read with section 78 of the BNS.
6. The victim's mother states that the victim is a student of class 12th; and does not wish to pursue the matter any further, since that would, in a sense, re-victimize her.
7. The petition is premised on Memorandum of Understanding dated 06.11.2025, whereby the petitioner and respondent No. 2 have resolved the matter amicably.
8. The petition is also supported by affidavits of the petitioners and of respondent No. 2.
9. Ms. Richa Dhawan, learned APP confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
10. In the circumstances, in line with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2012) 10 SCC 303 as also in ***Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2014) 6 SCC 466, this court sees no reason why the



subject FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom should not be quashed. This court is of the view that in light of the settlement between the contesting parties, continuing with the subject FIR and all subsequent proceedings would be an exercise in futility and would not be conducive to peace and harmony between the parties.

11. While allowing the petition however, this court considers it appropriate, that by way of atonement, the petitioner shall pay costs of Rs.10,000/- to Friendicoes SECA, No.271 & 273, Defence Colony Flyover Market, Jungpura, New Delhi within 04 weeks.
12. Subject to the aforesaid condition, case FIR No. 359/2025 dated 28.07.2025 registered under sections 75/79 of the BNS and section 12 of the POCSO Act at P.S.: Subzi Mandi, North Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.
13. Petitioner is directed to place on record the proof of payment of costs.
14. The Registry is directed to re-list the matter if costs are not paid as directed.
15. The petition stands disposed-of.
16. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

MARCH 13, 2026

V.Rawat