



\$~32

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7057/2025**

SANJAY GOEL

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Shorya Goel, Mr. Sammeer Vatts, Advocates alongwith Petitioner in Person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for the State
Mr. Namanveer Singh Sodhi,
Advocate alongwith R-2 & 3 in
Person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

29.01.2026

1. The petitioner has 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. 39/2020 dated 06.03.2020, lodged at Police Station Defence Colony, Delhi, under Sections 406/420 of Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], alongwith all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.
2. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Namanveer Singh Sodhi, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2&3.
3. The impugned FIR was lodged on the complaint of respondent No.



2-Company through its director, who is impleaded as respondent No. 3. The accused in the FIR is the petitioner, who was also the director of respondent No. 2-company and two other companies i.e. RSRN Buildcon Pvt. Ltd. and Nicky Marmo Ltd, who are impleaded as respondent Nos. 4 and 5 herein.

4. The dispute concerns allegations of misappropriation of funds of respondent No. 2. The complaint alleges that the petitioner herein, a promoter-director of respondent No. 2, committed criminal breach of trust and cheating by deliberately failing to submit a board resolution mandating joint operation of the company's ICICI bank account, thereby unilaterally transferring and siphoning company funds, including diversion of loan repayments from BKR Capital Pvt. Ltd. to third-party companies [respondent Nos. 4 and 5] and to himself, causing wrongful loss of about Rs. 1.95 crore to the company. There were also several civil litigations between the parties.

5. The litigations have all been settled by a mediated settlement agreement dated 24.09.2025 to which the present petitioner, and respondent Nos. 2 and 3 are party. The petitioner and respondent No. 3 are also related to each other. The settlement involves resolution of all the disputes, and the litigations arising out of it.

6. I have heard learned counsel for the parties. The petitioner has been identified by the Investigating Officer ["IO"] as well as by his learned counsel. Respondent Nos. 3 has also been identified by his learned counsel and the IO.

7. Learned counsel for the parties state that settlement has also been implemented fully.



8. The parties have settled their disputes voluntarily. The settlement is supported by board resolution of respondent No. 2 in favour of respondent No. 3, which specifically refers to the settlement of the disputes in the present FIR. Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 have also agreed not to pursue the FIR in question and to cooperate with the petitioners in the present quashing petition. Respondent No. 3 states that he has no objection to the FIR being quashed in its entirety.

9. The Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their powers under Section 528 of BNSS [corresponding to Section 482 of 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.

10. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.*¹, the Supreme Court has observed 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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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.

XXX

XXX

XXX

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 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 predominately 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 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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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

12. The offences alleged in the FIR arise out of a contractual and commercial transaction between the parties and are essentially private in nature. The parties are also related to each other. The dispute does not involve any overriding public interest. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties and the nature of the dispute, this Court is of the considered view that no useful purpose would be served by allowing the



criminal proceedings to continue, and that continuation of the same would only cause unnecessary diversion of public and judicial resources. The present case is, therefore, a fit one for exercise of the inherent jurisdiction of this Court.

13. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and proceedings arising out of FIR No. 39/2020 dated 06.03.2020 registered at Police Station Defence Colony, under Section 406/420 of the IPC is quashed.

14. The petition stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JANUARY 29, 2026

‘pv’/AD/

⁴ Emphasis supplied.