



\$~124

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 1022/2026 & CRL.M.A. 9614/2026**

ANMOL & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: **Mr. Saksham Kathuria, Advocate.**

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: **Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC with Mr. Sangeet Sibou, Mr. Aniket Kumar Singh, Advocates.**

SI Bhoopendra Singh, PS-Cyber Rohini.

Mr. Raj Kumar, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% 30.03.2026

1. The petitioners have filed this petition under Article 226 of the Constitution, seeking quashing of FIR No. 13/2023 dated 29.03.2023, registered under Sections 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, ["IPC"] at Cyber Police Station Rohini, District Rohini, Delhi, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.
2. Issue notice. Mr. Rahul Tyagi, learned Additional Standing Counsel (Criminal), accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Raj Kumar, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2.
3. With the consent of learned counsel for the parties, the petition is taken up for hearing.
4. The impugned FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No.



2 against the petitioners. The facts, as emerging therefrom, are that the complainant received a call from an unknown person on the pretext of delivery from AJIO and was induced to disclose an OTP received on her mobile phone. It is alleged that upon sharing the OTP, her AJIO account was compromised, and her registered mobile number was replaced with another number. Thereafter, a sum of Rs. 5,186/- was fraudulently transferred from her AJIO wallet to an unknown bank account. The complainant, upon discovering the fraud, contacted customer care, got her account blocked, and also lodged an online complaint on the cyber portal. On the basis of her statement and preliminary inquiry, the present FIR under Section 420 of the IPC came to be registered and investigation was initiated.

5. The offence under Section 420 of the IPC is compoundable. Mr. Saksham Kathuria, learned counsel for the petitioners, submits that the petitioners have not yet been served with notice upon filing of the chargesheet, and have, therefore, approached this Court by way of the present petition seeking quashing.

6. The parties have since settled their disputes amicably, as recorded in a Memorandum of Understanding dated 06.04.2026, whereby all disputes arising out of the impugned FIR stand resolved. In terms of the said settlement, respondent No. 2 has agreed to accord no objection to the grant of bail as well as to the quashing of the aforesaid FIR. It has further been agreed that no claims or proceedings shall be initiated *inter se* the parties in relation thereto. The settlement does not contemplate any monetary payment.

7. In view of the aforesaid, the parties jointly pray for quashing of the



impugned FIR.

8. The petitioners are present in person and are identified by their learned counsel, as well as by the Investigating Officer [“IO”]. Respondent No. 2 is present through video conference, and has been identified by her learned counsel and the IO.

9. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily and without any coercion or undue pressure.

10. The Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their extraordinary powers under Article 226, 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. Reference in this connection can be made to the judgment 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 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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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 petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

(i) ends of justice, or

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



(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 arises out of an instance of online fraud relating to an AJIO wallet, wherein respondent No. 2 was induced to disclose an OTP, leading to unauthorized access to her account and a fraudulent transfer of money. The dispute, though attracting the provisions of Section 420 of the IPC, is essentially of a private and financial nature, and does not involve any element of grave criminality or overriding public interest. The parties have since amicably resolved their disputes, as recorded in the Memorandum of Understanding dated 06.04.2026, and respondent No. 2 has unequivocally affirmed the voluntary nature of the settlement. In these circumstances, the criminal proceedings are unlikely to result in conviction, and its continuation would be an empty formality, adding to the burden of the justice system and consuming public

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



resources unnecessarily.

12. I am of the view that, as a measure of atonement, the petitioners ought to be directed to perform community service. Accordingly, the petitioners shall report to Hedgewar Arogya Sansthan and present themselves before the Medical Superintendent on 06.04.2026 at 03:00 PM. The Medical Superintendent is requested to assign suitable tasks to each of the petitioners, who shall undertake four sessions of community service of three hours each, to be completed within a period of two months, either jointly or separately, as deemed appropriate. The Medical Superintendent is further requested to issue a certificate of compliance upon completion of the aforesaid community service, which the petitioners shall place on record before this Court within a period of two weeks thereafter.

13. Having regard to the amount involved, the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties, and the discussion hereinabove, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 13/2023 dated 29.03.2023, registered under Section 420 of the IPC at Cyber Police Station Rohini, District Rohini, Delhi, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

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

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

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MARCH 30, 2026

'Bhupi/JM'/'