



\$~19-Q

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

+ CRL.M.C. 3262/2025 CRL.M.A. 14378/2025

AMIT MODI & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Shadman Ahmed Siddiqui and
Mr. Ahmad Ammar, Advocates.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP. Insp.
Ramkesh, PS-EoW.
Mr. Ankit Batra, Advocate for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **07.05.2026**

1. This is a petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, ["BNSS"] (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, ["Cr.P.C."]), seeking quashing of the FIR No. 73/2019 dated 13.02.2019, under Sections 420/467/468/471/506/120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], registered at Police Station Saket, District South, Delhi, and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of a settlement arrived at between the parties.
2. Issue notice. Mr. Tarang Srivastava, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Ankit Batra, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2-complainant.
3. The petitioners are present in Court and are identified by their counsel and the Investigating Officer ["IO"]. Respondent No. 2 is present through videoconferencing and is identified by his counsel and the IO.
4. The impugned FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No.



2 against the petitioners on the basis of allegations that the petitioners, through M/s Ashmi Holdings Pvt. Ltd., induced respondent No. 2 to invest approximately Rs. 3 crores in their hospitality business by allegedly showing forged agreements, fabricated financial statements, and false representations regarding acquisition and management of hotels.

5. Upon completion of the investigation, a chargesheet was filed on 29.04.2024 against the petitioners under Sections 406/420/506/120B of the IPC.

6. The parties have since settled their disputes by way of a deed of settlement dated 04.02.2024. The settlement stipulates payment of Rs. 93,00,000/- to respondent No. 2 towards full and final settlement of all claims. The parties agreed to withdraw/quash all pending litigation between them.

7. Statement of respondent No. 2 acknowledging receipt of the full settlement amount of Rs. 93,00,000/- from the petitioners has been placed on record.

8. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR.

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

10. The Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their powers under Section 528 of the BNSS [corresponding to Section 482 of the 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. Reference in this connection can be made to the judgment in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.*¹, which 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.

XXXX

XXXX

XXXX

61. The position that emerges from the above discussion can be summarised thus: the power of the High Court in quashing a criminal proceeding or FIR or complaint in exercise of its inherent jurisdiction is distinct and different from the power given to a criminal court for compounding the offences under Section 320 of the Code. Inherent power is of wide plenitude with no statutory

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



limitation but it has to be exercised in accord with the guideline engrafted in such power viz. : (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court. In what cases power to quash the criminal proceeding or complaint or FIR may be exercised where the offender and the victim have settled their dispute would depend on the facts and circumstances of each case and no category can be prescribed. However, before exercise of such power, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the crime. Heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. cannot be fittingly quashed even though the victim or victim's family and the offender have settled the dispute. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, any compromise between the victim and the offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, etc.; cannot provide for any basis for quashing criminal proceedings involving such offences. But the criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominatingly civil flavour stand on a different footing for the purposes of quashing, particularly the offences arising from commercial, financial, mercantile, civil, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony relating to dowry, etc. or the family disputes where the wrong is basically private or personal in nature and the parties have resolved their entire dispute. In this category of cases, the High Court may quash the criminal proceedings if in its view, because of the compromise between the offender and the victim, the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of the criminal case would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal case despite full and complete settlement and compromise with the victim. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceeding or continuation of the criminal proceeding would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that the criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding”²

Further, in *Narinder Singh and Ors. v. State of Punjab and Anr.*³, the

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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.”⁴

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



11. The present FIR arises out of a private commercial and financial dispute between the parties concerning alleged inducement and misrepresentation in relation to investment transactions. The parties have amicably resolved all disputes by way of settlement, pursuant to which respondent No. 2 has acknowledged receipt of the full settlement amount of Rs. 93,00,000/- and has stated that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily without any coercion or undue influence. In view of the comprehensive settlement and the absence of any surviving dispute, this Court is of the considered opinion that continuation of the proceedings arising out of the impugned FIR would serve no useful purpose, and the same deserves to be quashed in exercise of powers under Section 528 of the BNSS to secure the ends of justice.

12. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 73/2019 dated 13.02.2019, under Sections 420/467/468/471/506/120B/34 of the IPC, registered at Police Station Saket, District South, Delhi, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

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

14. The petition, alongwith the pending application, accordingly, stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 7, 2026
‘Bhupi’/