



\$~48

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

%

Date of Decision: 12th May, 2026

+ CRL.M.C. 3661/2026 & CRL.M.A. 14882/2026
ANSHUL GUPTA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Sumit Dagar and Mr. Amit
Baniwal, Advocates.
Petitioner in person.

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for the
State with W/SI Pinki.
Mr. Ashish Rohilla, Advocate for R-2
alongwith Respondent No.2 (through
video-conferencing)

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioner herein seeks quashing of FIR No. 0137/2020 dated 05.03.2020, registered at Police Station Dabri, for commission of offences under Sections 354/506/354(D) IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. As per the bare allegations appearing in the abovesaid FIR, complainant i.e. respondent No.2 reported about the conduct of petitioner to the police. According to her, petitioner-accused was threatening to kill her and was also intimidating her by saying that he would pour kerosene oil on



her or would damage her reputation in public by circulating her morphed photographs. Admittedly, she knew the petitioner beforehand as they were good friends but, on certain issues, the friendship was, eventually, broken and, thereafter, according to respondent No.2, the petitioner started threatening her.

3. Fact, however, remains that, even as per the allegations made in the FIR, she only apprehended threat at the hands of the petitioner and there is nothing which may indicate that any such photograph was ever circulated or posted anywhere.

4. Charge-sheet has been filed and charges have been framed for commission of offences under Sections 354(D)/506 IPC.

5. The case is at the stage of trial.

6. Fact, however, remains that both the sides have entered into amicable settlement and as per MoU dated 11.03.2026, all the disputes, misunderstanding and differences arising out of the abovesaid FIR have been amicably resolved and respondent No.2 has agreed to go for quashing of the FIR. It has also been mentioned in the MoU that respondent No.2 has not raised any claim, monetary or otherwise, with respect to the quashing of abovesaid FIR and they both have undertaken not to interfere in each other's personal and professional life, in any manner whatsoever.

7. Respondent No.2 has joined the proceedings through *video-conferencing* and she has duly identified by her counsel Mr. Ashish Rohilla. I.O. is also present and identifies her.

8. When asked, respondent No.2 acknowledges all the terms and conditions as mentioned in the abovesaid MoU and states that she has already moved on in her life and got married way back in the year 2021 and has a



daughter from such wedlock.

9. The petitioner herein has also married and is having his own family-life.

10. During course of the proceedings also, the petitioner tendered his apology to respondent No.2 and respondent No.2 submits that she has already forgiven him and, therefore, she does not want to pursue with the abovesaid FIR.

11. The case is of the year 2020 and, keeping in mind the overall facts, and the fact that the respondent No.2 is having her own separate matrimonial life and has also forgiven the petitioner, there does not seem to be any real impediment in quashing the petition as continuing with criminal proceedings would serve no real or useful purpose.

12. In *Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*, (2014) 6 SCC 466, the Apex Court observed that proceedings, even in non-compoundable cases, can be quashed on the basis of settlement provided that the Court is satisfied that there was no meaningful purpose in continuing with the proceedings, and that the scope of conviction was remote and bleak. Reference be made to *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.* (2012) 10 SCC 303.

13. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

14. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No. 0137/2020 dated 05.03.2020, registered at Police Station Dabri, for commission of offences under Sections 354/506/354(D) IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is, hereby, quashed subject to petitioner



depositing cost of Rs. 25,000/- in the account of *Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee (DHCLSC)* within four weeks. Proof of deposit and original affidavits of the parties alongwith original MoU be submitted to the learned Trial Court within further two weeks.

15. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

16. Pending application also stands disposed of.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MAY 12, 2026/ss/pb