



\$~63 Q

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 4487/2025**

JASKIRAT SINGH ALIAS JASSI & ORS.Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Sanjeev Kumar, Advocate.**

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondent

Through: **Mr. Tarang Srivastava, APP**

SI Deepa.

Counsel for R2 with R2 in person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **13.05.2026**

1. The petitioners have filed this petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"] (corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ["CrPC"]), seeking quashing of FIR No. 4/2024 dated 16.02.2024, registered under Section 420 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, ["IPC"] at Cyber Police Station Outer North, Delhi, and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.

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

3. The impugned FIR came to be registered at the instance of respondent No. 2/complainant alleging that he was induced to invest money in gold trading through an application namely "GBL Gold App" after being added to a WhatsApp group consisting of several persons who



represented themselves to be engaged in online trading activities. It was alleged that fictitious profits were projected through screenshots and representations made in the WhatsApp group, pursuant to which the complainant transferred substantial amounts into various bank accounts provided by the accused persons. Subsequently, when the complainant attempted to withdraw the invested amount, he was unable to do so and discovered that he had been blocked from the said groups and communication channels.

4. During investigation, the petitioners herein were arrayed as accused persons and chargesheet came to be filed on 07.05.2024 under Sections 420/120B/201 of the IPC.

5. Respondent No. 3, namely Sam Goswami @ Manjeet Goswami, has been impleaded in the present proceedings as he is one of the chargesheeted accused persons in the impugned FIR. As per the case of the prosecution, respondent No. 3 was alleged to be connected with the transactions forming subject matter of the present FIR and was accordingly arrayed as an accused during investigation. Though respondent No. 3 is not a petitioner in the present proceedings and is also not a signatory to the compromise deed dated 27.02.2025, he has been impleaded as a party respondent since the relief sought in the present petition concerns the impugned FIR and consequential proceedings arising therefrom.

6. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have amicably resolved all their disputes and entered into a Compromise Deed dated 27.02.2025. It is recorded in the Deed that respondent No. 2 has already received the entire alleged cheated amount, including amounts recovered



during investigation as well as amounts paid during bail proceedings.

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

8. In view of the aforesaid, the parties jointly pray for quashing of the impugned FIR and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

9. The Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their extraordinary powers under Section 528 of the BNSS, 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,

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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.

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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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

10. The present case arises out of alleged online financial transactions relating to investment through the “GBL Gold App”. The dispute essentially emanates from a private financial transaction between the parties. The complainant has categorically stated that he has received the entire amount and does not wish to pursue the matter further. It is further submitted that the disputes between the complainant and the present petitioners stand amicably resolved in terms of the Compromise Deed dated 27.02.2025. In the considered opinion of this Court, the possibility of conviction in the present case appears remote and bleak. Continuation of the criminal proceedings would therefore serve no useful purpose and would merely result in unnecessary prolongation of litigation.

11. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and FIR No. 04/2024 dated 16.02.2024 registered under Section 420 of the IPC at Cyber Police Station Outer North, Delhi, alongwith all consequential proceedings

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

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

13. The petition, accordingly, stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

MAY 13, 2026

SS/JM/