



\$~51

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3264/2025 & CRL.M.A. 14381/2025**

RAHUL SINGH & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Prabhash Kumar, Advocate
with petitioners in person.

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for State
with SI Pradeep Kumar, PS Cyber
NW Delhi
Mr. Mohit Yadav and Mr. Sunil
Kumar, Advocates for R-2 with R-
2 through VC

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

%

28.03.2026

This petition was scheduled to be listed on 02.03.2026 but has been listed today, as 02.03.2026 was declared a holiday vide Notification No. 64/G-4/Genl.-I/DHC dated 27.02.2026.

1. The petitioners have filed the present 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. 46/2022 dated 12.08.2022, registered at Cyber Police Station, North-West, under Sections 419, 420, 120B, 201, and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], alongwith all proceedings arising therefrom, on the ground that the parties have arrived at a



settlement.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Aashneet Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Mohit Yadav, learned counsel, accepts notice on behalf of respondent No.2.

3. The petitioners are present in Court and have been identified by their learned counsel as well as by the Investigating Officer. Respondent No. 2 is also present in person and has been identified by her learned counsel and the Investigating Officer.

4. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of learned counsel for the parties.

5. The impugned FIR was registered at the instance of respondent No. 2. The allegations, as set out therein, are that she was lured by unknown persons through an online “*work from home*” job offer advertised on a platform such as *Quicker.com*, pursuant to which she was contacted telephonically and induced to deposit various amounts under the pretext of registration, document verification, and other formalities through digital payment modes. It is further alleged that, on the assurance of securing employment, she transferred multiple sums of money, aggregating to approximately Rs. 7,000/-, after which the said persons became untraceable and switched off their phones, thereby cheating her.

6. During the pendency of the matter, the parties amicably resolved their disputes and entered into a settlement, which was reduced into writing by way of a Memorandum of Understanding dated 23.04.2025, whereby the petitioners agreed to pay a sum of Rs. 7,500/- to respondent No. 2.

7. Learned counsel for the parties submit that the settlement has been



entered into voluntarily and without any coercion or undue pressure, and in view thereof, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIR.

8. The Supreme Court has held that, in appropriate cases, the High Courts may exercise their inherent powers under Section 528 of the BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 of the CrPC) to quash criminal proceedings, including those involving non-compoundable offences, where the parties have arrived at a compromise and such quashing does not adversely affect any overarching public interest.

9. The Supreme Court, in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*¹ has 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, 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

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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 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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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 offences alleged in the subject FIR arise out of an online financial transaction between the parties and are predominantly private and personal in nature. The dispute neither involves any element of grave or heinous criminality nor has any wider ramifications on public interest. Applying the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court, it is also evident that respondent No. 2 has unequivocally affirmed before this Court that the settlement has been entered into voluntarily, out of her own free will, and without any coercion, undue influence, or pressure, and that the settled amount of Rs. 7,500/- has been duly received by her. In these circumstances, the possibility of a conviction is remote and bleak, and continuation of the criminal proceedings, therefore, would serve no meaningful purpose and would merely amount to an exercise in futility,

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



resulting in unnecessary prolongation of litigation and avoidable burden on the judicial system.

11. In view of the foregoing, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 46/2022 dated 12.08.2022, registered at Police Station Cyber Cell, North-West, under Sections 419, 420, 120B, 201, and 34 of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings 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

MARCH 28, 2026

'sv'/SD/