



\$~75 & 76 Q

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4291/2026**

ASHOK KUMAR SINGH & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Brahmanand Gupta, Mr. Jai Prakash Prasad, Mr. Ankit Kumar, Advocates alongwith Petitioners in Person.

versus

STATE THROUGH SHO

PS BHALSWA DAIRY & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State.
SI Mahender Koli, PS Bhalswa Dairy.
Mr. Dheeraj Kumar Pandey,
Advocate

+ **CRL.M.C. 4292/2026**

KESHAV SINGH & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Dheeraj Kumar Pandey,
Advocate.

versus

STATE THROUGH

PS BHALSWA DAIRY & ORS.Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP for State.
SI Mahender Koli, PS Bhalswa Dairy.
Mr. Brahmanand Gupta, Mr. Jai Prakash Prasad, Mr. Ankit Kumar, Advocates alongwith Respondents in Person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **26.05.2026**

CRL.M.A. 17280/2026 (exemption) in CRL.M.C. 4291/2026

CRL.M.A. 17285/2026 (exemption) in CRL.M.A. 4292/2026

Exemptions allowed, subject to all just exceptions.



The applications stand disposed of.

CRL.M.A. 17281/2026 (condonation of delay in refiling) in CRL.M.C. 4291/2026

CRL.M.A. 17286/2026 (condonation of delay in refiling) in CRL.M.C. 4292/2026

By way of the present applications, the applicants seek condonation of delay of 21 days in refiling CRL.M.C. 4291/2026 and 19 days in refiling CRL.M.C. 4292/2026.

In view of the reasons stated therein, the applications are allowed, and the delay in re-filing is condoned.

The applications stand disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 4291/2026 & CRL.M.C. 4292/2026

1. The present petitions under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"] (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ["CrPC"]) seek quashing of two FIRs, namely, FIR No. 682/2015 dated 09.10.2015 registered for offences punishable under Sections 323/452/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"] [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 4291/2026] and FIR No. 659/2015 dated 30.09.2015 registered for offences punishable under Sections 323/325/342/34 of the IPC [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 4292/2026], alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom. Both FIRs were registered at Police Station Bhalswa Dairy, District North West, Delhi, and the relief is sought on the basis of a settlement arrived at between the parties.

2. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by Ms. Manjeet Arya, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, for the State. Mr. Dheeraj Kumar Pandey, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2-5 in



CRL.M.C. 4291/2026. Mr. Brahmanand Gupta, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2-5 in CRL.M.C. 4292/2026.

3. The parties are present in Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer as well as by their respective counsel.

4. The present matters arise from two cross-FIRs, namely FIR No. 682/2015 and FIR No. 659/2015, registered at Police Station Bhalswa Dairy, Delhi, both of which emanate from the same incident and involve parties who are closely related and known to each other through family and personal relations. The FIRs arose out of a personal and monetary dispute between relatives and acquaintances, which subsequently escalated into a physical altercation, resulting in the registration of the aforesaid cross-cases.

5. In FIR No. 659/2015, the complainant Vinod Singh alleged that accused Keshav Singh had taken money on the pretext of arranging employment for his brother through his contacts. When the promised job was not secured and the complainant's family demanded return of the money, the accused allegedly avoided repayment for several years. On 14.06.2015, the complainant, alongwith his relatives, visited the accused's house to collect the remaining amount, where they were allegedly wrongfully confined and assaulted by the accused and his associates. It was further alleged that the complainant and his relatives sustained injuries, during the incident and were medically examined at Babu Jagjivan Ram Memorial ["BJRM"] Hospital. On the basis of the complaint and Medico-Legal Case ["MLC"] reports, the present FIR came to be registered, and investigation was initiated.

6. Upon completion of the investigation, chargesheet was filed. By order dated 03.06.2019, the Trial Court framed charges against the



accused under Sections 323/325/342/34 of the IPC.

7. In FIR No. 682/2015 [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 4291/2026], the complainant Keshav Singh alleged that on 14.06.2015 the accused persons forcibly entered his house and assaulted him and his family members. It was alleged that the accused persons abused, threatened to kill them, and caused injuries to the complainant, his son Ajit Singh, and driver Sunny Singh. The complainant further alleged that one of the accused was apprehended by the public, while the others fled from the spot. PCR officials allegedly shifted the injured persons to BJRM Hospital, where their MLCs were prepared and simple injuries were noted.

8. Upon completion of the investigation, chargesheet was filed, and an offence under Section 454 of the IPC was added. By order dated 27.02.2020, the Magistrate's Court framed charges under Sections 324/454/34 of the IPC.

9. During pendency of the proceedings, the disputes were settled *vide* a settlement order dated 14.05.2018 before the Mediation Centre, Rohini Courts, Delhi. As per the settlement, both parties agreed to withdraw/compound the cases filed against each other and to cooperate before this High Court for quashing of the FIRs, if necessary.

10. The respective complainants have also placed on record their affidavits affirming the voluntary nature of the settlement and stating that they have no objection to the quashing of the impugned FIRs and all consequential proceedings.

11. I have heard learned counsel for the parties.

12. In CRL.M.C. 4291/2026 arising out of FIR No. 682/2015, the MLCs on record reflect simple injuries sustained by three injured



persons, namely Keshav Singh, Ajit Singh, and Sunny Singh. In CRL.M.C. 4292/2026 arising out of FIR No. 659/2015, the MLCs reflect simple injuries suffered by Vipin Kumar Singh and Neeraj Kumar, whereas the opinion in respect of Vinod Kumar Singh and A.K. Singh was kept reserved. The FIR records that Vinod Kumar Singh had sustained a grievous injury on account of a fracture. However, Mr. Vinod Kumar Singh [Respondent No. 4 in CRL.M.C. 4292/2026], appears in person, and states that he did not suffer any permanent disability or lasting damage on account of the injury and that the parties have now decided to bury the hatchet and move forward peacefully.

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

14. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIRs and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

15. It is well settled that, even in respect of non-compoundable offences, the High Court may, in appropriate cases, exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash criminal proceedings on the basis of a settlement 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 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*

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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 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.

² Emphasis supplied.

³(2014) 6 SCC 466.



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

16. The present matters arise from cross-FIRs between acquaintances/family members, and the allegations therein are predominantly private in nature, stemming from a personal financial dispute, which has since been amicably resolved. The injuries sustained by the parties, as reflected in the MLCs, are predominantly simple in nature, except in the case of Mr. Vinod Kumar Singh, whose submissions have also been recorded above. In these circumstances, the case does not appear to involve any heinous criminality or overbearing public interest. The continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose; rather, it would unnecessarily prolong discord between the

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



parties.

17. Having regard to the nature of the dispute and the injuries sustained, the absence of any substantial societal impact, and the voluntary settlement arrived at between the parties, this Court is of the view that continuation of the criminal proceedings would lead to an unnecessary expenditure of judicial time and impede the restoration of harmony between the parties. The voluntary nature of the settlement also makes convictions unlikely. This Court, therefore, considers it a fit case for the exercise of its inherent powers under Section 528 of the BNSS to secure the ends of justice and prevent abuse of the process of law.

18. Accordingly, the petitions are allowed, and FIR No. 682/2015 dated 09.10.2015 registered for offences punishable under Sections 323/452/506/34 IPC and FIR No. 659/2015 dated 30.09.2015 for offences punishable under Sections 342/325/323/34 of the IPC, both registered at Police Station Bhalswa Dairy, District North West, Delhi, alongwith all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed, subject to costs of Rs. 20,000/- by the petitioners collectively in each case to be paid to the Delhi High Court Bar Association Costs Account [A/C No.15530110179338; IFSC No. UCBA0001553; UCO Bank, Delhi High Court Branch] within a period of two weeks from today.

19. The parties shall remain bound by the terms and conditions of the settlement.

20. The petitions, alongwith any pending applications, accordingly stand disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 26, 2026/‘pv/JM’/