



\$~71

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 7272/2025**

VINOD BANSAL & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: **Mr. Sunil Yadav, Adv.**

versus

CENTRAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATIONRespondent

Through: **Mr. Rajesh Kumar, SPP with Ms. Mishika Pandita and Mr. Changez Khan, Adv.**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA

ORDER

% **14.10.2025**

CRL.M.A. 30522/2025 EXEMPTION

Allowed, subject to all just exceptions.

The application stands disposed of.

CRL.M.C. 7272/2025

1. This is a petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C read with Section 528 of BNSS for quashing of FIR bearing RC/219/2019/E0001 against the petitioners under Section 120-B/420/467/468/471 IPC and 13(2) read with 13(1)(D) of PC Act 1988 registered at P.S. CBI/EO-1 and the subsequent proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of settlement arising between the parties.
2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submits that petitioners have come to an amicable settlement with the bank and have paid back all



the dues and the bank has issued 'No dues Certificate'.

3. Learned counsel who appears for the CBI has opposed the petition stating that even as per the letter of the bank dated 13.03.2025, the OTS has been considered by the bank as a commercial decision having no bearing whatsoever on the ongoing criminal case/investigation and that the same shall proceed as per law.

4. He further relies on the judgment of the Supreme Court in the case of **Sushil Suri vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Anr. (2011) 5 SCC 708** to argue that on identical facts, despite settlement, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had refused to quash the FIR.

5. Per contra, learned counsel places reliance on the judgment of Supreme Court in the case of **N.S.Gnaneshwaran Etc. vs. Inspector of Police and Anr. 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1257** wherein in an FIR registered under Section 420/468/471/120B IPC and under Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, on the basis of settlement, the Hon'ble Supreme Court had permitted to quashing of the FIR.

6. However, in **Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab and Anr. (Special Leave Petition (Crl.) No. 8989/2010)**, the Hon'ble Supreme Court held that any compromise between the victim and offender in relation to the offences under special statutes like 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.

7. The judgment of **Gian Singh (Supra)** has been further followed in the case of **Anil Bhavarlal Jain and Anr. Vs. The State of Maharashtra**



and Ors. (SLP (Crl. No. 12776/2023)).

8. At this stage, learned counsel seeks time for making further submissions.

9. Renotify on 11.02.2026.

RAVINDER DUDEJA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2025/ib/sk