



\$~45

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

+ **W.P.(CRL) 3941/2025**

RISHI AHUJA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Abhijat Bal, Senior Advocate
with Mr. Nikhil Mehta, Mr. Varun
Sharma and Mr. Harsh Vikram
Trivedi, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel
(Crl.) for the State.
Mr. Rajat Wadhwa and Ms. Anshika
Juneja, Advocates for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI

ORDER
23.02.2026

%

By way of the present petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India read with section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ('Cr.P.C.'), the petitioner seeks quashing of case FIR No.414/2019 dated 23.12.2019 registered under sections 354A/341 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('IPC') and section 8 of Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 ('POCSO') at P.S.: Patel Nagar, Delhi.

2. The subject FIR was lodged on the allegation that the petitioner had accosted respondent No.2 and had touched her in a manner that she had considered inappropriate at that time.



3. However, the present petition is premised on a Settlement-cum-Compromise Agreement dated 20.11.2025, whereby the petitioner and respondent No. 2 have resolved the matter amicably. The petition is also supported by affidavits of the petitioner and of respondent No. 2.
4. As recorded in order dated 24.12.2025, the victim as well as her father were present in court alongwith their counsel on that date; and they had informed the learned Predecessor Bench that they have no objection to the quashing of the subject FIR. The complainant had also clarified that the FIR had come to be lodged due to misunderstanding and miscommunication on her part, arising from a language issue, since the victim hails from Kerala and was new to Delhi.
5. On the last date of hearing *i.e.* 03.02.2026, respondent No.2 had joined the proceedings *via* video-conferencing while her father was physically present in court. At that stage, yet again, this Bench had queried respondent No.2 and she had said that upon reflection, she believes that the petitioner's actions were not vitiated by sexual intent and that she had misconstrued those acts by reason of her young age (since she had just turned 17 years old at that time) and was labouring under a language barrier.
6. Most importantly, respondent No.2 had told the court that now that she has completed her education, she is looking forward to a peaceful and dignified personal and professional life; and the pendency of the present case in Delhi, while she is ordinarily residing in Kerala, is proving to be an onerous burden on her. The sentiment expressed by



respondent No.2 was therefore that she was being ‘re-victimised’ by the pendency of the case in Delhi.

7. Since on the last date, this court had exempted the personal presence of respondent No.2 as well as her father, the father has joined the proceedings *via* video-conferencing from Kerala alongwith his local counsel. Mr. Rajat Wadhwa, learned counsel is representing respondent No.2 in court. They reiterate that in light of Settlement-cum-Compromise Agreement dated 20.11.2025, respondent No.2 does not wish to pursue any further proceedings in the subject FIR.
8. Mr. Sanjay Lao, learned Standing Counsel confirms that the State has no objection to the subject FIR being quashed.
9. In the circumstances, in line with the law laid down by the Supreme Court in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2012) 10 SCC 303 as also in ***Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*** reported as (2014) 6 SCC 466, this court sees no reason why the subject FIR and all proceedings emanating therefrom should not be quashed. This court is of the view that in light of the settlement between the contesting parties, continuing with the subject FIR and all subsequent proceedings would be an exercise in futility and would not be conducive to peace and harmony between the parties.
10. In view of the clear and consistent stand taken by respondent No.2, this court is inclined to allow the present petition.
11. Accordingly, case FIR No.414/2019 dated 23.12.2019 registered under sections 354A/341 IPC and section 8 POCSO at P.S.: Patel Nagar, Delhi is quashed. All proceedings arising therefrom also stand closed.



12. Petition stands disposed-of.
13. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed-of.

ANUP JAIRAM BHAMBHANI, J

FEBRUARY 23, 2026/ak