



\$~114-Q

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3198/2026 & CRL.M.A. 12943/2026**

SARTAJ ALI & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Pramod Chaudhary, Mr. Arjun Singh, Mr. Ankit Besoya, Mr. Amit Malik and Mr. Ajay Yadav, Advocates.

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP along with Mr. Abhimanyu Arya, Advocate. Mr. Rajesh Rathod and Ms. Afsha, Advocate for respondents. SI Rakesh.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

27.04.2026

1. By way of the present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No. 100/2026 dated 19.03.2026, registered at P.S. Sangam Vihar, New Delhi, under Sections 79/115(2)/117(2)/351(2)/351(3)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a settlement arrived at between the parties.
2. Issue notice. Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Rajesh Rathod, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2 to 4.



3. The petitioners are present before the Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer as well as by their learned counsel. Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 are also present in Court, and have also been identified by the Investigating Officer and their learned counsel.

4. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of learned counsel of parties.

5. The parties are neighbours and are related to one another. It is pertinent to note that petitioner No. 1 and petitioner No. 4, namely Sartaj Ali and Asad Ali, are referred to in the FIR as “*Sanu*” and “*Arshad*,” respectively. The impugned FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No. 4, who is the complainant. Respondent No. 3 is her husband, and respondent No. 2 is known to them.

6. The FIR alleges that on 18.03.2026 the complainant’s brother visited the mechanic shop of petitioner No. 2, located at G-Block, Sangam Vihar, to collect his pending salary. It is stated that petitioner No. 2 refused to make the payment and issued threats to him. Upon being informed of the incident, the complainant, alongwith her husband and another individual who was known to them, proceeded to the said shop. It is alleged that petitioner No. 2, alongwith the other petitioners, abused them and, upon objection, assaulted them. It is further alleged that petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 restrained the complainant’s husband as well as the individual accompanying him and struck them with a hammer.

7. The Medico-Legal Certificate records that the injuries sustained by respondent No. 3 were opined to be grievous, whereas the injuries sustained by respondent No. 2 and respondent No. 4 were opined to be simple in nature. It is, however, submitted that, in the case of respondent



No. 3, the injuries, *albeit* grievous, were not of a lasting nature.

8. During the pendency of the present proceedings, the parties amicably resolved their disputes by executing a Compromise Deed dated 13.04.2026, i.e., within one month of the incident in question. In terms of the said settlement, no monetary consideration has been agreed upon between the parties; however, the petitioners have in fact borne, the medical expenses incurred by respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in connection with the impugned FIR, thereby addressing the underlying grievance.

9. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR, along with all proceedings arising therefrom.

10. Respondent Nos. 2 to 4 have filed their respective affidavits in support of the present petition, thereby affirming the terms of the settlement arrived at between the parties.

11. The parties have also confirmed that they have amicably resolved their disputes and do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings arising out of the impugned FIR.

12. It is well settled that even in cases involving non-compoundable offences, the Supreme Court has consistently held that the High Court may, in appropriate cases, exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash an FIR and the proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of a settlement arrived at between the parties. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.*¹, the Supreme Court 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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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

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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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.”⁴

13. The present case arises out of a neighbourhood scuffle between parties who are related to one another. The nature of the injuries, as



emerging from the record, indicates that although one injury was opined to be grievous, the remaining injuries were simple, and even the former is stated to be without any lasting consequence. In this backdrop, the overall nature and impact of the incident do not warrant the continuation of criminal proceedings, particularly in view of the subsequent settlement between the parties. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have amicably resolved their disputes and have affirmed the settlement before this Court, expressing their unwillingness to pursue the proceedings arising out of the impugned FIR. In these circumstances, I am of the view that this is a fit case for the exercise of inherent jurisdiction of this Court, as such an order would secure the ends of justice by enabling the parties to maintain peace and harmony rather than perpetuating animosity.

14. In light of the principles laid down by the Supreme Court, it is also noted that the respondents have unequivocally affirmed before this Court that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily and without any coercion. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the continuation of the criminal proceedings appears unlikely to result in a conviction and would serve no meaningful purpose, thereby unnecessarily burdening the judicial system and resulting in an avoidable expenditure of judicial time and public resources.

15. The petition is, accordingly, allowed. FIR No. 100/2026 dated 19.03.2026, registered at P.S. Sangam Vihar, New Delhi, under Sections 79/115(2)/117(2)/351(2)/351(3)/3(5) of BNS, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed, subject to the

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



petitioners undertaking community service at Dr. Baba Saheb Ambedkar Hospital. The Medical Superintendent of the said hospital is requested to assign appropriate duties to the petitioners for 6 sessions of 3 hours each, to be completed over a period of 3 months, either collectively or separately, with the nature, and timing of such duties to be determined by the Medical Superintendent. Upon completion thereof, the petitioners shall file compliance affidavits alongwith a certificate issued by the said hospital within a period of one week.

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

17. The petition, alongwith the pending applications, is accordingly disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 27, 2026
SS/SD/