



\$~4

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2253/2026 & CRL. M.A. 9212/2026

VISHAL SHARMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Jujhar Singh, Advocate with
Petitioner in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Yudhvair Singh Chauhan, APP
with Ms. Sangeeta, Adv. SI Harsh,
P.S. Paharganj.
Mr. Shreyas Malik and Mr. Dhruv
Kumar, Advocates with R2 in
person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

28.03.2026

1. By way of the present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"] (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ["CrPC"]), the petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No. 276/2020 dated 29.10.2020, registered at Police Station Pahar Ganj, District Central, New Delhi, under Sections 506/509 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Yudhvair Singh Chauhan, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Shreyas Malik, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 –



complainant.

3. At the outset, Mr. Jujhar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that CRL.M.C. 3457/2024 [*Ajay Kumar Aggarwal and Ors. v. The State of NCT of Delhi and Anr.*], seeking quashing of the cross-FIR bearing No. 327/2020 dated 10.12.2020, registered at Police Station Pahar Ganj, District Central, New Delhi, under Sections 323/354A/506/509/34 of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, was allowed by the Bench of Hon'ble Dr. Justice Swarana Kanta Sharma by order dated 28.03.2026. CRL.M.C. 3457/2024 is, therefore, deleted from the cause list of this Bench.

4. The parties are neighbours residing in the same building. The impugned FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No. 2, alleging that the petitioner verbally abused her, blamed her for causing damage to his car, and misbehaved with her. Upon completion of investigation, a chargesheet was filed.

5. The parties have since settled their disputes under the aegis of the Delhi Mediation Centre, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, as recorded in a Settlement dated 10.04.2023. They, therefore, seek quashing of the impugned FIR.

6. The petitioner and respondent No. 2 are present in Court, and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer as well as by their respective learned counsel.

7. The settlement has been arrived at without any monetary consideration. It records that the impugned FIR, as well as the cross-FIR bearing No. 327/2020, registered against the father and brother of respondent No. 2, arose out of a misunderstanding regarding the use of



common areas and facilities.

8. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily, and without any coercion or undue pressure. The affidavit of respondent No. 2 has also been placed on record, affirming the voluntary nature of the settlement, and conveying her no-objection to quashing of the impugned FIR, and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

9. The Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances; the High Courts, in exercise of their powers under Section 482 of the CrPC [corresponding to Section 528 of the BNSS], can quash criminal proceedings, even with respect to non-compoundable offences, on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant, especially when no overarching public interest is adversely affected.

10. The Supreme Court, in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2012) 10 SCC 303], 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 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.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

Further, in *Narinder Singh and Ors. v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2014) 6 SCC 466], 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 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.]

11. The present matter arises out of a neighbourhood dispute between two families residing in the same building, who have now decided to bury the hatchet. I am informed by learned counsel for the parties that the parties continue to reside in the same building. In these circumstances, quashing of the impugned FIR would enable the parties to live in peace and harmony, rather than compound the animosity. Applying the tests laid down by the Supreme Court, it may be noted that respondent No. 2 has also categorically affirmed the voluntary nature of the settlement before this Court. The continuation of the criminal proceedings is, therefore, unlikely to result in a conviction, and would constitute an unnecessary diversion of judicial resources.

12. As noted above, the cross-FIR bearing No. 327/2020 dated 10.12.2020, registered at Police Station Pahar Ganj, District Central, New Delhi, also stands quashed.



13. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 276/2020 dated 29.10.2020, registered at Police Station Pahar Ganj, District Central, New Delhi, under Sections 506/509 of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

14. The petition, alongwith pending application, accordingly stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MARCH 28, 2026

“Bhupi/KA”/