



2026:DHC:8591



\$~46 and 47

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

% **Date of Decision: 30.09.2026**

CNR No. DLHC010383052026

+ **CRL.M.C. 6042/2026 & CRL.M.A. 25257/2026**

(46) SACHIN PURI & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Brijesh Sharma, Adv.
versus

STATE THROUGH SHO PS MEHARULI & ANR.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for State
along with Mohd. Naved and Mr.
Mayank Chaudhary, Adv.
Mr. Sudhakar Mudgil, Adv. for R-2.
SI Sumit Yadv, PS Mehrauli.

CNR No. DLHC010383192026

+ **CRL.M.C. 6044/2026 & CRL.M.A. 25271/2026**

(47) VIJAY ABROL & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Sudhakar Mudgil, Adv.
versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP for State
along with Mohd. Naved and Mr.
Mayank Chaudhary, Adv.
Mr. Brijesh Sharma, Adv. for R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SACHIN DATTA

SACHIN DATTA, J. (ORAL)

1. In CRL.M.C. 6042/2026, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.632/2018 dated 22.09.2018, registered under Sections 354/451/506/509/34 IPC at PS Mehrauli, and all proceedings emanating

CRL.M.C. 6042/2026 & connected matter

Page 1 of 4

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed By:ROHIT
KUMAR PATEL
Signing Date:01.10.2026
21:32:59



2026:DHC:8591



therefrom, including CR Case No.4211/2021 pending before the learned JMFC (Mahila Court), South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi. After the filing of the charge sheet, the learned Trial Court, vide order dated 21.09.2024, found a prima facie case to be made out under Sections 506/509/34 IPC against all the petitioners, and under Section 354 IPC against petitioner no.1 alone.

2. In CRL.M.C. 6044/2026, the petitioners seek quashing of FIR No.550/2018 dated 09.08.2018, registered under Sections 354/354A/34 IPC at PS Mehrauli, and all proceedings emanating therefrom, including CR Case No.4920/2020, pending before the learned JMFC (Mahila Court), South District, Saket Courts, New Delhi. The charge sheet in the said FIR was filed under Sections 354/354A/323/34 IPC against one Mr. Pawan Kumar Sahnna, and under Sections 323/34 IPC against the petitioners.

3. The parties to both petitions are members of the same extended family, and two cross-FIRs came to be registered on account of the disputes between them.

4. The present petitions have been filed on the basis of a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) dated 06.05.2026 executed between the two sides of the family. The said MoU seeks to resolve several proceedings pending between members of the family, including the two FIRs in question. It is expressly non-monetary, and records the parties' reciprocal undertaking to cooperate in the withdrawal, compounding or quashing of the proceedings identified therein.

5. It is pointed out that family disputes between the parties have festered for a long time, which have now been resolved by way of the MoU dated 06.05.2026.

CRL.M.C. 6042/2026 & connected matter

Page 2 of 4



2026:DHC:8591



6. It is noticed that the MoU (Clause 3) expressly excludes FIR No.437/2018 concerning offences under the POCSO Act, stated to be pending before the Juvenile Justice Board, and Complaint Case No.164/2024, which is stated to pertain to the POCSO matter.

7. It is confirmed by the Investigating Officer (IO) that the FIRs, quashing of which is sought, are unconnected with FIR No.437/2018 and Complaint Case No.164/2024.

8. It is also pointed out by the learned APP for the State that in FIR No.550/2018 (subject matter of CRL.M.C. 6044/2026), the person against whom the primary allegations were levelled, i.e. Mr. Pawan Kumar Sahnna, has passed away.

9. It is confirmed by the IOs that the two FIRs pertain to *inter se* family disputes and that their quashing would not compromise the adjudication of the excluded POCSO-related matters.

10. It is submitted by the parties that the disputes have been settled voluntarily, without any force, fear or coercion, and that there is no objection to the quashing of the both the FIRs.

11. The law on the subject is well settled. The Supreme Court, in ***Gian Singh v. State of Punjab***, (2012) 10 SCC 303, ***Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab***, (2014) 6 SCC 466, and ***State of Madhya Pradesh v. Laxmi Narayan***, (2019) 5 SCC 688, has held that the inherent power of the High Court to quash criminal proceedings is distinct from the statutory power to compound offences. This inherent power, preserved by Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, may be exercised even in respect of non-compoundable offences where the dispute has a predominantly civil

CRL.M.C. 6042/2026 & connected matter

Page 3 of 4



2026:DHC:8591



character or the wrong is essentially private or personal, the parties have genuinely resolved their entire dispute, and the Court is satisfied that the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and that the continuation of the proceedings would cause oppression or would not serve the ends of justice. Heinous and serious offences, which have an impact on society at large, are ordinarily not to be quashed merely on the basis of a settlement.

12. In the specific circumstances, where the FIRs arise out of *inter se* family disputes which stand settled, there appears to be no impediment in acceding to the joint request of the petitioners and the complainants for quashing of FIR Nos.632/2018 and 550/2018.

13. In view thereof, and there being no serious objection on behalf of the State, the present petitions are allowed.

14. FIR No.632/2018 and FIR No.550/2018, and all proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

15. The petitions stand disposed of in the above terms, along with the pending applications.

SACHIN DATTA, J

SEPTEMBER 30, 2026/cl,sd