



\$~19-Q

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ CRL.M.C. 3014/2025, CRL.M.A. 13396/2025
ANKIT BHANDULA@ SONUPetitioner
Through: Mr. Prashant Vashist, Advocate
alongwith Petitioner in Person.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondent
Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for State.
SI Chanchal, PS C.R. Park
Mr. Akash Khurana, Advocate for
R-2 alongwith R-2 in Person (VC).

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **28.04.2026**

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. 105/2023 dated 25.03.2023, registered under Sections 420/406/379/120B of the Indian Penal Code, 1860, ["IPC"] at Police Station Chittaranjan Park, District South, Delhi, and 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. Akash Khurana, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2-complainant.
3. Pursuant to the order dated 10.09.2025, a status report has been



placed on record.

4. The FIR was registered on the basis of a complaint by Mr. Tej Kumar Kaul/respondent No. 2 and his wife Mrs. Neelam Kaul, alleging that Rajesh Jugdesh Sujanani, alongwith his associates Kapil Batra and Ankit Bhandula @ Sonu (present petitioner), committed financial fraud against them. It is alleged that the accused Rajesh, who is related to the complainants (nephew of Mrs. Neelam Kaul) and was residing with them, gained their trust during the COVID-19 period and misused access to their bank accounts, mobile phones, ATM PINs, and financial instruments, and also obtained signed cheques from the complainants under the pretext of official work. It is alleged that he withdrew and transferred money from the complainants' bank accounts, credit cards, and a family trust account to his own accounts and those of his associates, including through digital platforms such as Paytm and UPI.

5. During investigation, accused Rajesh was arrested and allegedly disclosed his involvement in transferring the funds in question to co-accused Kapil Batra and the present petitioner through bank transfers, cash, and the purchase of gold and a vehicle. The petitioner was also arrested, and a sum of Rs. 5,35,000/- was recovered at his instance. He disclosed that he received funds in his and his wife's accounts.

6. Accused Kapil Batra was found absconding, and despite issuance of notice under Section 41A of the Cr.P.C, he did not join the investigation, leading to issuance of Non-Bailable Warrants against him. Subsequently, a monetary settlement was arrived at between co-accused Kapil Batra and the complainants, on the basis of which the criminal proceedings against Kapil Batra were quashed by a coordinate Bench of



this Court *vide* order dated 06.09.2024 in CRL M.C. 4694/2024.

7. The investigation is still ongoing, and the chargesheet has not yet been filed.

8. The present petition has been filed on the ground that the petitioner has also amicably settled the dispute with the complainants, by entering into a Settlement Deed dated 01.03.2024, pursuant to which a sum of Rs. 45,00,000/- has been paid by the petitioner and duly received by the complainants.

9. The petitioner is present in person and is identified by his learned counsel, as well as by the Investigating Officer [“IO”]. Respondent No. 2 is also present through video-conferencing, and has been identified by his learned counsel and the IO.

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

11. Respondent No. 2 also affirms before the Court that he has received the entire amount as contemplated in the settlement.

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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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, 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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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 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

13. The present case arises out of financial dealings between the parties, which are predominantly private in nature. The principal accused Rajesh, and the complainants, are members of the same family. The

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



complainants have earlier settled the matter with a co-accused Kapil Batra, and the criminal proceedings have been quashed against him. I do not see any reason to treat the petitioner's case differently. There is no additional public interest or allegation of heinous criminality. The parties have amicably settled the dispute, and the petitioner has paid Rs. 45,00,000/- to respondent No. 2, who has duly acknowledged the same and affirmed the voluntary nature of the settlement. In view of the principles laid down by the Supreme Court, and considering that the possibility of conviction is remote, continuation of proceedings would serve no useful purpose and amount to abuse of process. Accordingly, this Court finds it appropriate to exercise its inherent powers to secure the ends of justice.

14. Having regard to the above discussion, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 105/2023 dated 25.03.2023, registered at P.S. Chittaranjan Park, District South, Delhi, under Sections 420/406/379/120B of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

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

16. The petition, alongwith pending application, accordingly, stands disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 28, 2026

'pv/JM'/'