



\$~8

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

+ CRL.M.C. 4546/2019

MANJEET SINGH AND ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kumar Vivek Vibhu,
Advocate for P-1

versus

THE STATE (THROUGH GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHLI) &
ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya, APP
Mr. Ashish, Advocate

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

07.02.2026

1. By way of the present petition under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ["CrPC"], the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No. 186/2018 dated 24.06.2018 registered at Police Station Dwarka South, New Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 420/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, insofar as it relates to petitioner No. 1.

2. The FIR arose from allegations that petitioner No. 1 sold property bearing No. 56, Block-C, Sector-8, Dwarka, New Delhi [hereinafter, "subject property"] to the complainant, i.e., respondent No. 2 herein, for a consideration of Rs. 25,50,000/- vide registered sale deed dated 12.06.2013, without disclosing that the subject property was already mortgaged with C.F.H.L. Bank Ltd. in relation to a loan availed by the co-accused, namely Mr. Harpal Singh, for which petitioner No. 1 had



stood as a surety. It was alleged that upon default in repayment of the said loan, the bank took possession of the subject property and subsequently auctioned the same.

3. The co-accused, Mr. Harpal Singh, was impleaded as a petitioner pursuant to an application filed by petitioner No. 1, in terms of the order dated 12.12.2022. However, no affidavit in support of the present petition was filed by petitioner No. 2 at any stage.

4. The present petition is founded on the ground that the disputes between the complainant and petitioner No. 1 were subsequently amicably resolved pursuant to a Memorandum of Understanding [“MoU”] dated 22.04.2019, between petitioner No. 1 and respondent No. 2, whereunder the parties agreed to a full and final settlement, upon payment of a sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- by petitioner No.1 to respondent No.2. During the pendency of the present proceedings, this Court was informed on 29.08.2025 that the complainant/respondent No.2 had expired on 13.08.2025.

5. Pursuant to the directions of this Court, the said fact was duly verified by the Investigating Officer *vide* verification report dated 20.09.2025. It was further submitted that steps were being taken for disbursement of the balance settlement amount, in terms of the MoU, in favour of the complainant’s spouse, who is the sole surviving legal heir.

6. In the course of hearing, the factual position emerges that petitioner No. 2 is a proclaimed offender. As reflected in the Status Report filed by the Investigating Officer, despite efforts having been made to trace petitioner No. 2, he remains untraceable, and proceedings under Section 82 CrPC have been initiated against him.



7. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, as the offences in the present case are compoundable, Mr. Kumar Vivek Vibhu, learned counsel for the petitioner, seeks permission to withdraw the present petition, with liberty to approach the learned Trial Court for compounding of the offences, insofar as petitioner No. 1 is concerned.

8. In view of the above, the present petition stands dismissed as withdrawn, with liberty as aforesaid.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

FEBRUARY 7, 2026
dy/SD/