



\$~38-Q

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

+ CRL.M.C. 8303/2025, CRL.M.A. 34600/2025

DEEPAK KUMAR CHAUHAN & ANR.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Saurabh & Mr. Prince Saini,
Advocates alongwith Petitioners in
Person.

versus

THE STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Hitesh Vali, APP for State.
Mr. Uttam Singh, Advocate for R-
2 alongwith R-2 in Person.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE PRATEEK JALAN

ORDER

% **28.04.2026**

1. The petitioners have preferred the present petition seeking quashing of FIR No. 241/2018, dated 31.07.2018, registered at Police Station Sunlight Colony, South-East District, Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 323/341/506/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ["IPC"], alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of a settlement between the parties.
2. Issue notice. Mr. Hitesh Vali, learned Additional Public Prosecutor, accepts notice on behalf of the State. Mr. Uttam Singh, learned counsel accepts notice on behalf of respondent No. 2.
3. The petitioners are present before the Court and have been duly identified by the Investigating Officer as well as by their learned counsel. Respondent No. 2 is also present in Court and has been identified by the



Investigating Officer as well as by his learned counsel.

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

5. The facts as emerging from the FIR are that the respondent No. 2 was residing on rent at House No. 25, Nangli Rajapur, Sarai Kale Khan, New Delhi. He subsequently shifted to a rented accommodation at House No. 37 in Nangli Rajapur. On 22.08.2018 at about 10:00 AM, while he was stepping out of the premises, he was stopped by the sons of the landlord, being petitioners herein, who requested him to furnish his identification. The respondent No. 2 stated that he would provide the same on the following day, as only a few days had elapsed since he had taken the premises on rent. It is alleged that an altercation thereafter ensued between the parties, in the course of which the respondent No. 2 sustained injuries to his hands. He thereafter proceeded to the AIIMS Trauma Center, where he was medically examined. It is further alleged that certain threats were also extended to the respondent No. 2 in connection with the said incident.

6. I am informed that, although the MLC records the injuries sustained as grievous in nature, no sharp-edged weapon or firearm is stated to have been used in the commission of the offence, and there are no lasting or permanent adverse consequences arising from the said injuries.

7. A chargesheet was subsequently filed, pursuant to which Section 201 of the IPC was also added. However, *vide* order dated 02.07.2022, charges were framed only under Sections 325, 341, and 506(2) of the IPC.



8. During the pendency of the present proceedings, the parties have amicably resolved their disputes under the aegis of the Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, by way of a Settlement Deed executed on 04.07.2025, in terms whereof the petitioners have agreed to pay a total sum of Rs. 1,00,000/- to respondent No. 2 in two instalments. It is submitted that the first instalment has already been paid before the Ld. Referral Court, and the balance amount of Rs. 50,000/- has been handed over in Court by way of a demand draft to respondent No. 2.

9. It is further submitted that the cross-FIR bearing No. 243/2018, lodged by the mother of the petitioners against respondent No. 2 at Police Station Sunlight Colony under Sections 354 and 509 of the IPC, has already been compounded *vide* order dated 04.12.2025 passed by the learned Magistrate, Saket Courts.

10. The parties have affirmed before this Court that they have amicably resolved their disputes. Respondent No. 2 has further stated that he does not wish to pursue the present criminal proceedings against the petitioners.

11. It is well settled that, notwithstanding the non-compoundable nature of certain offences, the Supreme Court has consistently held that the High Court may, in appropriate cases, exercise its inherent jurisdiction to quash an FIR and all consequential proceedings on the basis of a settlement arrived at between the parties. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab and Anr.*¹, 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***

¹ (2012) 10 SCC 303.



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 & 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

² Emphasis supplied.

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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

⁴ Emphasis supplied.



12. The present case arises out of a landlord-tenant dispute which culminated in an altercation between the parties. The nature of the incident, as borne out from the record, indicates that no sharp-edged weapon or firearm was used, and the injuries stated to have been sustained did not result in any lasting or permanent adverse consequences to respondent No. 2. It is further pertinent that the cross-FIR lodged in relation to the same incident has already been compounded, and the parties have since entered into a full and final settlement, pursuant to which the entire agreed amount has been received by respondent No. 2. Respondent No. 2 has also categorically stated before this Court that he harbours no subsisting grievance against the petitioners and does not wish to pursue the matter any further.

13. In the aforesaid circumstances, where the dispute is essentially private in nature and stands fully resolved between the parties, the continuance of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and would merely result in the unnecessary prolongation of litigation. The quashing of the present FIR would, therefore, subserve the ends of justice by bringing finality to the dispute and enabling the parties to move forward without any lingering acrimony.

14. Applying the principles enunciated by the Supreme Court, it is further evident that respondent No. 2 has unequivocally affirmed before this Court that the settlement has been arrived at voluntarily, of his own free will, and without any coercion or undue influence. In the facts and circumstances of the present case, the possibility of the proceedings culminating in a conviction appears remote, and their continuation would amount to a futile exercise, resulting in the unwarranted expenditure of



judicial time and public resources.

15. The present petition is, accordingly, allowed, and FIR No. 241/2018 dated 31.07.2018, registered at Police Station Sunlight Colony, South-East District, Delhi, for offences punishable under Sections 323, 341, 506, and 34 of the IPC, alongwith all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

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

17. The petition, alongwith the pending applications, is accordingly disposed of.

PRATEEK JALAN, J

APRIL 28, 2026

'pv'/SD/