



\$~21-Q

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7024/2025**

VISHAL YADAV & ORS.

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Vipul Lamba, Adv.

Versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **20.04.2026**

CRL.M.A. 12203/2026 *(for condonation of delay in filing amended memo of parties)*

1. This application has been filed by the petitioner seeking condonation of 138 days' delay in filing the amended memo of parties.
2. For the reasons stated, the application is allowed, and the delay of 138 days in filing the amended memo of parties is condoned.
3. The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 7024/2025

4. The petitioners have preferred the present petition seeking quashing of FIR No. 381/2014, dated 08.09.2014, registered at Police Station South Campus, South District, Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 323/341/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of



a settlement between the parties.

5. Pursuant to order dated 30.10.2025, the petitioner has filed an amended memo of parties impleading respondent No. 3, who was also injured in the incident pertaining to the impugned FIR.

6. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2 and 3.

7. The petitioners are present before the Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer ["IO"] as well as by their learned counsel. Respondent No. 2 is also present in Court, and respondent No. 3 is present through video conference. They have also been identified by the IO as well as by their learned counsel.

8. The petitioners and respondent No. 2 were in the same college at ARSD College, Delhi University. The FIR came to be registered at the instance of respondent No. 2, who alleged that on 08.09.2014 at around 11:40 AM, upon entering the college premises, he saw respondent No. 3 involved in a fight. When he approached, the petitioners, alongwith Rahul Hans and Anshu Kumar instigated violence by calling others to beat him. As respondent Nos 2 and 3 attempted to flee, their way was blocked, and they were assaulted and beaten with kicks and punches, while petitioner No. 2 assaulted respondent No. 2 with a stick.

9. I am informed that the injuries sustained were simple in nature and that no sharp weapon or firearm was used in the commission of the alleged offence. Respondent Nos. 2 and 3, who are present, state that there were no lasting consequences.

10. During the pendency of the present proceedings, the parties have



amicably resolved their disputes by way of a Settlement Deed executed between them on 13.08.2025.

11. The parties have confirmed before this Court that they have settled their disputes amicably. Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 also confirm that they do not wish to pursue the criminal proceedings against the petitioners.

12. Mr. Vipul Lamba, learned counsel for the petitioner, submits that proceedings arising out of the impugned FIR *qua* Rahul Hans and Anshu Kumar have already been quashed by this Court *vide* orders dated 06.07.2023 in CRL.M.C. 3521/2023 and 08.08.2023 in CRL.M.C. 5600/2023 respectively.

13. Even in cases involving non-compoundable offences, the Supreme Court has consistently held that, in appropriate cases, the High Court may exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash an FIR and the proceedings arising therefrom 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 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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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 & Ors. v. State of Punjab & 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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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

14. The present case stems from a dispute between students of the same college, which culminated in a scuffle. More than twelve years have passed since the incident. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have resolved their disputes amicably by way of a settlement, and the injuries sustained by respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are stated to be simple in nature, and there are no lasting consequences. In view of these circumstances, I am of the view that the present case warrants the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction, as such an order would advance the

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



ends of justice by enabling the parties to live in peace and harmony rather than perpetuating animosity.

15. Applying the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court, it is further noted that respondent Nos. 2 and 3 have categorically affirmed before this Court that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily. In the given factual matrix, the continuation of the criminal proceedings is unlikely to culminate in a conviction and would amount to an empty formality, thereby unnecessarily burdening the judicial system and leading to the avoidable consumption of public resources.

16. Proceedings against two other co-accused, being Rahul Hans and Anshu Kumar, have already been quashed on the basis of settlement by this Court. There is therefore no impediment in granting the relief sought.

17. The petition is, accordingly, allowed, FIR No. 381/2014, dated 08.09.2014, registered at Police Station South Campus, South District, Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 323/341/506/34 of IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

18. Having regard to the circumstances giving rise to the impugned FIR and the nature of allegations therein, I accept the suggestion of Mr. Vali that the present case warrants the imposition of community service upon the petitioners. The petitioners are accordingly directed to report to the Medical Superintendent, VMMC & Safdarjung Hospital on 24.04.2026 at 11:00 AM., who shall assign them suitable duties and tasks for 3 hours a day for 6 sessions, to be completed within the next two months. The nature, and timing of such duties shall be determined by the Medical Superintendent, and may be assigned to each of the petitioners



separately or together. The petitioners shall file compliance affidavits alongwith a certificate issued by the said hospital within one week thereafter.

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

20. The petition, alongwith the pending applications, is accordingly disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 20, 2026

Tg/AD/