



\$~100

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2410/2026 & CRL.M.A. 9835/2026
MOHD ARMAN & ORS.Petitioner
Through: Mr. Firoz Iqbal Khan, Advocate.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondent
Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for State.
ASI Surya Kant, SI Vishal, PS
Bhalswa Dairy.
Mr. Sajid Ahmed, Advocate for R-
2 alongwith R-2 in Person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER
01.04.2026

%

1. The petitioners have 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. 93/2026, dated 23.02.2026, registered at Police Station Bhalswa Dairy, New Delhi, under Sections 110/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 ["BNS"], and all proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.
2. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Sajid Ahmed, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 – complainant.



3. The parties are present in Court, and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer as well as their respective learned counsel.
4. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.
5. The impugned FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No. 2, alleging that, on 21.02.2026, the petitioners, who reside in the same neighbourhood as him, threw a dead dog near his house leading to an altercation. It is further stated that although the dispute was initially settled, on 22.02.2026, the petitioners attacked him and struck him with sticks and lathis.
6. It appears from the record that the parties settled the disputes within five days after the incident. The statement of respondent No. 2 to this effect is recorded in an order of the Sessions Court dated 27.02.2026, by which bail was granted to some of the petitioners. A compromise deed has also been executed thereafter on 16.03.2026.
7. The settlement has been arrived at without any monetary consideration. Learned counsel for the parties confirm that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily, and without any coercion or undue pressure.
8. Although the nature of injuries has not been definitively stated in the MLC at this stage, respondent No. 2, who is present in Court, also states that the injuries did not require hospitalisation and he was discharged on the same day.
9. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR.
10. 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.

11. 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.]

12. In the present case, the offences alleged in the subject FIR arise out of a neighbourhood dispute between the parties. There were no lasting injuries. It also appears that there was no sharp weapon or firearm involved in the incident. The disputes is thus essentially private in nature, and does not involve any element of public interest or offences of a heinous nature. I am informed that three of the petitioners are also young, being between 19 to 25 years in age. Learned counsel for the parties also state that the parties continue to reside in the same neighbourhood. 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 observed that respondent No. 2 has categorically affirmed the voluntary nature of the settlement before the Court. The criminal proceedings are thus unlikely to result in a conviction, and their continuation would be a mere formality, adding to the burden on the justice system and unnecessarily consuming public resources.

13. However, having regard to the circumstances giving rise to the impugned FIR, I accept the suggestion of Mr. Vali that this is an appropriate case for direction of community service. The petitioners are directed to report for community service to the Medical Superintendent, Burari Hospital, Delhi, on 10.04.2026 at 11:00 AM. The Medical Superintendent is requested to assign suitable duties to the petitioners



either separately or together for a total of 5 sessions of 3 hours each, to be completed within a period of two months. The Medical Superintendent is requested to issue a certificate of compliance upon completion of the community service. The petitioner shall place the said certificate on record within 2 weeks thereafter.

14. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 93/2026 dated 23.02.2026, registered at Police Station Bhalswa Dairy, New Delhi, under Sections 110/3(5) of the BNS, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

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

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 1, 2026

'pv'/AD/