



\$~89 & 47 Q

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

+ CRL.M.C. 5124/2026

CHANDER PAL & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Himanshu Pal, Advocate.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP.

SI Naveen Kumar.

Mr. Aditya Swaroop, Advocate for
R-2.

+ CRL.M.C. 5330/2025, CRL.M.A. 22975-76/2025

RAM KUMAR & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Aditya Swaroop, Advocate.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP.

SI Naveen Kumar.

Mr. Himanshu Pal, Advocate, for
R-2 to R-4.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **23.07.2026**

1. The present petitions have been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ["BNSS"], corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, seeking quashing of two cross-FIRs registered at Police Station Mehrauli, Delhi, along with all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the basis of a



settlement arrived at between the parties. The first FIR, being FIR No. 685/2013 dated 28.09.2013, was registered for offences punishable under Sections 324/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 [“IPC”] and is the subject matter of CRL.M.C. 5124/2026. The second FIR, being FIR No. 686/2013 dated 28.09.2013, was registered for offences punishable under Sections 323/452/427/506/34 of the IPC and is the subject matter of CRL.M.C. 5330/2025.

2. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Aditya Swaroop, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 5124/2026, while Mr. Himanshu Pal, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent Nos. 2 to 4 in CRL.M.C. 5330/2025.

3. The parties in the respective petitions are present before the Court and have been duly identified by their respective counsel and the Investigating Officer.

4. The present petitions arise out of two cross-FIRs registered in respect of the same incident. The complainant in CRL.M.C. 5124/2026 is petitioner No. 2 in CRL.M.C. 5330/2025, whereas the complainant in CRL.M.C. 5330/2025 is petitioner No. 3 in CRL.M.C. 5124/2026. Accordingly, the parties in the two petitions are arrayed as complainants and accused against each other in cross-cases arising out of the same occurrence.

5. The parties are neighbours and are related to each other. Petitioner No. 3 in CRL.M.C. 5124/2026 is the daughter-in-law of respondent No. 2 therein, while petitioner Nos. 1 and 2 are her parents. The petitioners in the connected petition, CRL.M.C. 5330/2025, are members of her



matrimonial family and are arrayed as the in-laws of respondent No. 2 therein. The two FIRs arise out of the same occurrence and set out rival versions of the altercation alleged to have taken place between the parties on 28.09.2013.

6. The complainant in CRL.M.C. 5330/2025, who is petitioner No. 3 in CRL.M.C. 5124/2026, alleged that, at about 3:00 p.m. on 28.09.2013, the accused persons, i.e. the petitioners in CRL.M.C. 5124/2026, forcibly entered her parental home and assaulted her father, respondent No. 3. She further alleged that the accused persons thereafter proceeded to her beauty parlour at Maidan Garhi, where they broke the glass of the shop and assaulted respondent No. 2 and her mother, respondent No. 4, with an iron rod. It was further alleged that the accused persons threatened them with death before leaving the spot. The complainant also alleged that she had been subjected to harassment by her husband, father-in-law and mother-in-law even prior to the incident.

7. The complainant in CRL.M.C. 5124/2026, however, presented a counter-version of the events which allegedly occurred shortly thereafter, at about 3:30 p.m. on the same day. According to her, she was alone at her residence when the accused persons, who are the respondents in CRL.M.C. 5330/2025, allegedly entered her house, damaged household articles, assaulted her and threatened to kill her. It was further alleged that petitioner No. 1 inflicted knife injuries on her left forearm, while petitioner Nos. 2 and 3 restrained her by holding her hands and feet. She was thereafter taken to the AIIMS Trauma Centre, where the Medico-Legal Case [“MLC”] recorded simple sharp injuries. On the basis of her statement, the FIR was registered and the investigation was thereafter



undertaken.

8. In CRL.M.C. 5124/2026, although the MLC records two lacerations on the victim's forearms, the injuries were classified as simple in nature. Respondent No. 2 has also confirmed that the injuries did not result in any lasting injury or permanent damage.

9. I am informed that chargesheet has been filed in both the cases.

10. During the pendency of the present proceedings, the parties entered into a settlement on 16.07.2026. Affidavits of the respective complainants, expressing their no objection to the quashing of the impugned FIRs and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, have also been placed on record.

11. In view of the aforesaid settlement, the parties seek quashing of the impugned FIRs and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom.

12. The Supreme Court has held that, even in cases involving non-compoundable offences, the High Court may, in appropriate cases, exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash the FIR and consequential proceedings on the basis of a settlement between the parties. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2012) 10 SCC 303], 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 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.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

Further, in *Narinder Singh and Ors. v. State of Punjab and Anr.* [(2014) 6 SCC 466], 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 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.”

[Emphasis supplied.]

13. The present matters arise out of cross-FIRs lodged by family members of two spouses in relation to the same incident. Although there were injuries caused by a sharp object, as reflected in the MLCs, these were classified as simple in nature, no firearm was used in the incident and the injuries did not result in any lasting impact or permanent damage. The parties have since amicably settled their disputes and have placed affidavits on record affirming the voluntary nature of the settlement and expressing their no objection to the quashing of the impugned FIRs and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom. The complainants in the respective FIRs have also affirmed the settlement and expressed their no objection to the quashing of the proceedings.



14. In these circumstances, continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and is unlikely to result in a fruitful prosecution, while unnecessarily diverting judicial resources. The parties have a familial relationship, and reside in the same neighbourhood. The continuation of the proceedings would, in the circumstances, only serve to perpetuate animosity and friction between them. This Court, therefore, considers the present matters to be fit cases for the exercise of its inherent jurisdiction under Section 528 of the BNSS to quash the impugned FIRs and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, thereby bringing quietus to the dispute and promoting peace between the parties.

15. The petitions are accordingly allowed. FIR No. 685/2013, dated 28.09.2013, registered at Police Station Mehrauli, Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 324/506/34 of IPC [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 5124/2026], and FIR No. 686/2013, dated 28.09.2013, registered at the same police station for offences punishable under Sections 323/452/427/506/34 of the IPC [subject matter of CRL.M.C. 5330/2025], alongwith all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

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

17. The petitions, alongwith pending applications, stand disposed of.

18. Bail bonds, if any, stand discharged.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

JULY 23, 2026/SS/SD/