



2026:DHC:8185



\$~65

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% **Date of Decision: 21st September, 2026**# **CNR No. DLHC010447322026**+ **CRL.M.C. 6968/2026****JAVED ANSARI & ORS.**

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Ruksar Ahmad, Advocate with
petitioners in person.

versus

**THE STATE OF DELHI PS JAFRABAD NORTH EAST &
ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Shoaib Haider, APP for the State.
(M): 9899723716Email: shoaibhaideradvocate@gmail.com

SI Arvind Kumar, PS Jafrabad.

(M): 9953964554

Mr. Asif Ali, Advocate for respondent
nos. 2, 3 and 4.**CORAM:****HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (Oral):**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita ("BNSS"), read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ("CrPC"), for quashing of the First Information Report ("FIR") being *FIR 68/2026* registered on 25th March, 2026, at Police Station ("PS") Jafrabad, under Sections 115(2), 333, 331(1) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita ("BNS").
2. Issue notice.



3. Notice is accepted by learned Additional Public Prosecutor (“APP”) appearing for the State, i.e., respondent no. 1, as well as learned counsel appearing for the private parties, i.e., respondent nos. 2 to 4.
4. The parties are present before this Court and are identified by their respective learned counsels, as well as the Investigating Officer (“IO”).
5. The petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of the parties.
6. As per the petition, the petitioners as well as respondent no. 2 are residents of Delhi, and *FIR 68/2026* was registered at PS Jafrabad, at the instance of respondent no. 2.
7. As per the aforesaid FIR, the alleged incident took place on 21st March, 2026, and the FIR was registered on 25th March, 2026. The Chargesheet in the present matter is yet to be filed.
8. This Court is informed that the respondents have arrived at an out-of-Court compromise with the petitioners by way of a Deed of Settlement dated 14th August, 2026, with the help of senior and elders of the society.
9. A copy of the aforesaid Deed of Settlement has been placed on record before this Court.
10. It is submitted that the petitioners and respondent no. 2 have amicably compromised/settled all their disputes and differences, for all times to come in the future, out of Court and without any pressure, force or coercion.
11. It is undertaken by the petitioners and respondent no. 2 that they shall withdraw all complaints filed by them against each other.
12. This Court is informed that the parties to this petition have agreed that respondent no. 2 has not taken any settlement amount from the petitioners for quashing of the FIR in question.
13. This Court is further informed that except Section 333 of the BNS,



which is non-compoundable, the other sections of the BNS under which the FIR in question was lodged, are compoundable in nature.

14. The Supreme Court has clearly held that, in certain circumstances, the High Courts, in exercise of their powers under Section 528 of the BNSS (corresponding to Section 482 of CrPC), 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.

15. The Supreme Court, in *Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and Another*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, has held as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

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.

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

16. Further, in *Narinder Singh and Others Versus State of Punjab and Another, (2014) 6 SCC 466*, the Supreme Court has also laid down guidelines for High Courts for accepting settlement deeds executed between parties and quashing of proceedings. The relevant observations in the said decision read as under:

“xxx xxx xxx

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.

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

17. This Court notes that the criminal proceedings in the present case arise out of disputes between the petitioners and respondent no. 2, who are neighbours, and that the parties have amicably resolved all their *inter-se* disputes.

18. Respondent no. 2 is present before this Court, and is also represented by his lawyer.

19. It is affirmed before this Court that the Deed of Settlement dated 14th



August, 2026, has been entered into voluntarily by respondent no. 2.

20. In view of the aforesaid, the prospect of a conviction has been ruled out and the continuation of the criminal proceedings in such circumstances would be an exercise in futility, serving no useful purpose and resulting only in unnecessary consumption of judicial time and resources.

21. There is no impediment in granting the relief sought before this Court.

22. Having regard to the aforesaid discussion, the petition is allowed and *FIR 68/2026* registered on 25th March, 2026, at PS Jafrabad, under Sections 115(2), 333, 331(1) and 3(5) of the BNS, along with the consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is hereby quashed.

23. However, having regard to the facts and circumstances of the present case and submissions made before this Court, the petitioners are directed to deposit a consolidated cost of Rs. 15,000/- with the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee.

24. The parties will remain bound by the terms of the Deed of Settlement dated 14th August, 2026.

25. Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of.

26. Proof of the cost shall be filed by learned counsel appearing for the petitioners.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

SEPTEMBER 21, 2026

c