



\$~83 & 99

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 2404/2026, CRL.M.A. 9795/2026**

RAVI KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dinesh Kumar Sharma, Adv.

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP with SI
Nivedita and SI Shikha.

Mr. Siddhant Saini, Advocate for
R-2.

+ **CRL.M.C. 2409/2026, CRL.M.A. 9834/2026**

PUNEET MADAN

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Dinesh Kumar Sharma, Adv.

versus

STATE GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP with SI
Nivedita and SI Shikha.

Mr. Siddhant Saini, Advocate for
R-2

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **01.04.2026**

1. The present petitions have been filed 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 two cross-FIRs, being FIR No. 438/2024 dated 07.08.2024, registered under Sections 115(2)/126(2)/75 of the Bharatiya Nyaya



Sanhita, 2023 [“BNS”] and FIR No. 436/2024 dated 07.08.2024, registered under Sections 115(2)/126(2)/74 of BNS, both registered at Police Station Keshav Puram, Delhi. FIR No. 438/2024 forms the subject matter of CRL.M.C. 2404/2026, whereas FIR No. 436/2024 forms the subject matter of CRL.M.C. 2409/2026. The petitions are premised on a settlement arrived at between the parties.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State in both petitions. Mr. Siddhant Saini, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 in both petitions.

3. All parties are present in Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer as well as by their respective learned counsel. The parties have confirmed before this Court that they have amicably resolved their disputes and do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against each other.

4. The petitions are taken up for hearing together with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.

5. The parties in the present matters are known to each other, being related through a landlord-tenant arrangement and having resided in close proximity. The disputes appear to have arisen out of continuing interpersonal discord between the two families. FIR No. 438/2024 has been lodged by the tenant against the husband of the landlord, whereas FIR No. 436/2024 has been lodged by the landlord against her tenant, i.e. the husband of the complainant in FIR No. 438/2024.

6. In FIR No. 438/2024 [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 2404/2026], the allegations arise from an incident when the complainant/tenant had



approached her landlord in connection with a prior altercation, during which the petitioner, who is the husband of the complainant in FIR No. 436/2024, is alleged to have acted inappropriately and restrained her. It is also the case of the complainant that she was in an advanced stage of pregnancy at the relevant time.

7. In FIR No. 436/2024 [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 2409/2026], the allegations stem from a separate dispute between the complainant-landlord and her tenant, who is the husband of the complainant in FIR No. 438/2024, arising out of a disagreement relating to the placement of a cot in a common passage, in the course of which the petitioner is alleged to have engaged in a verbal and physical altercation with the complainant.

8. The parties seek quashing of the aforesaid FIRs on the ground that they have now decided to bury the hatchet, and in furtherance thereof, the parties have entered into a settlement by way of Settlement Deeds dated 02.09.2025 and 27.03.2026, in CRL.M.C. 2404/2026 and CRL.M.C. 2409/2026, respectively, without any monetary consideration. Affidavits of the respective complainants have also been placed on record, affirming the voluntary nature of the settlement and recording their no objection to the quashing of the impugned FIRs and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

9. I am further informed that the parties are no longer residing in the same locality, thereby reducing the likelihood of any future disputes.

10. The Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their powers under Section 528 of BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 of CrPC), 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 & Anr.*¹ has 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.”²

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.

² Emphasis supplied.



Further, in *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & 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

(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

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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

12. Applying the aforesaid principles to the facts of the present case, I am of the view that the present petitions warrant exercise of its inherent jurisdiction for quashing of the cross-FIRs. The disputes in question arise out of a neighbourhood/landlord-tenant discord between parties who were residing in close proximity, and do not, *prima facie*, disclose any element of heinous or serious criminality. It has further been brought to the notice of this Court that the parties are no longer residing in the same locality, thereby considerably reducing the likelihood of any recurrence of disputes.

13. In view of the amicable settlement arrived at between the parties, the possibility of conviction appears to be remote and bleak. Continuation of the criminal proceedings, in such circumstances, would serve no useful purpose and would amount to an unnecessary burden on judicial resources. On the other hand, quashing of the FIRs would subserve the ends of justice by enabling the parties to put a quietus to their impending disputes.

14. The petitions are, therefore, allowed, and all proceedings emanating from FIR No. 438/2024 dated 07.08.2024 under Sections 115(2)/126(2)/75 of the BNS and FIR No. 436/2024 dated 07.08.2024

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



under Sections 115(2)/126(2)/74 registered at P.S. Keshav Puram, are hereby quashed, subject to deposit of costs of Rs.5,000/- by the petitioners in each case with the Delhi High Court Bar Association [A/C No. 15530110179338, IFSC No. UCBA0001553, Bank Name: UCO Bank, Branch: Delhi High Court], within two weeks from today. An affidavit of compliance shall be filed within two weeks thereafter.

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

16. The petitions, alongwith the pending applications, accordingly stand disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 1, 2026

SS/SD/