



2026:DHC:8977



\$~23

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

% **Date of Decision: 06th October, 2026**

CNR No. DLHC010422192026

+ **CRL.M.C. 6624/2026 & CRL.M.A. 27700/2026**

ARUN PUNDIR & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, Adv., along with
petitioners in person
Mob: 9958031223
Email: rajadvocate1985@gmail.com

versus

THE STATE (GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI) & ORS.Respondents

Through: Mr. R.P.S. Bhatti, Adv. for R-2 to 4,
along with R-2 to 4 in person
Mob: 9810568180
Email: rpsbhatti37@gmail.com
Ms. Chanchal Sharma, Adv.
Mob: 8700767450
Email:
chanchalsharma8032@gmail.com
Mr. Vikram Singh, ASI, PS Karawal,
Nagar
Mob: 9868749094

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, 2023 ("BNSS"), seeking quashing of the First
Information Report ("FIR"), being *FIR No. 514/2017*, dated 04th October,



2026:DHC:8977



2017, registered at Police Station (“PS”) Karawal Nagar, North-East, Delhi, under Sections 323/342/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 (“IPC”), and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement between the parties.

2. Issue Notice.

3. Notice is accepted by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor (“APP”) for the State as well as by learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2 to 4.

4. The parties, i.e., the petitioners as well as respondent no. 2 to 4, are present before this Court, and are duly identified by their respective counsels as well as the Investigating Officer (“IO”), who is also present before this Court.

5. The captioned petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of the parties.

6. The relevant facts for the adjudication of the captioned petition, culled out from the documents on record, are as follows:

6.1. The FIR in question came to be registered on 04th October, 2017, pursuant to the statement of respondent no. 2, i.e., the complainant, who alleged that on 02nd October, 2017, when the complainant was at a grocery shop, pursuant to a comment made by the complainant, Sh. Arun Pundir, i.e., petitioner no. 1, got agitated and called some boys through his mobile phone.

6.2. He stated that, subsequently, petitioner no. 1 was joined by his son, i.e., petitioner no. 2, and some other boys, who beat up and abused the complainant. Upon getting a hint of the said scuffle, the complainant’s



2026:DHC:8977



brothers, i.e., respondent no. 3, namely, Sh. Suraj, and respondent no. 4, namely, Sh. Pankaj, arrived at the spot. The complainant along with respondent nos. 3 and 4 were beaten up by the petitioners and their associates.

6.3. It is further stated that respondent no. 4, i.e., Sh. Pankaj called the police. The police took respondent nos. 2 to 4 to the Jag Pravesh Chandra Hospital, Shashti Park, Delhi, wherein, the said respondents were treated for their injuries *vide MLC Nos. 10682/2017, 10683/2017 and 10684/2017*, respectively. In the said *MLCs*, it was opined by the concerned doctor that the cause of the injury pertained to physical assault by 04 – 05 persons.

6.4. Subsequently, a Chargesheet dated 15th September, 2018, came to be filed before the Trial Court, against the petitioners, by the Investigating Officer (“IO”) under Sections 323/342/34 of the IPC.

6.5. The wife of petitioner no. 1 had also registered *FIR No. 515/2017*, at PS Karawal Nagar, North East, Delhi, against the complainant, i.e., respondent no. 2.

6.6. During the pendency of the proceedings, the parties amicably resolved all their disputes *vide* Compromise Deed dated 21st August, 2026, whereby, the parties agreed to cooperate in quashing the FIR in question as well as the other FIR.

7. Learned counsels appearing for the parties jointly submit that they have settled the dispute and do not wish to pursue the matter any further.

8. Respondent nos. 2 to 4 are present in Court, who submit that they have settled the matter with the petitioners, and do not wish to pursue the present matter any further.



2026:DHC:8977



9. They further submit that a connected FIR between the parties also stands settled, and thus, in view thereof, they do not wish to pursue the present matter any further.

10. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the FIR in question.

11. Learned APP for the State submits that since the FIR in question is of the year 2017, some cost ought to be imposed upon the petitioners.

12. Having heard the learned counsels appearing for the parties, this Court notes that the present matter has been finally settled between the parties.

13. It is no longer *res-integra* that this Court has the power to quash the criminal proceedings in cases of non-compoundable offences under the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (“Cr.P.C”), i.e., now the BNSS, wherein, the parties have settled the matter between themselves. Thus, this Court is of the opinion that it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings in the present case, since the offence, although non-compoundable, has been resolved by way of the Compromise Deed dated 21st August, 2026.

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 the 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 the case of ***Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab***



2026:DHC:8977



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



2026:DHC:8977



own facts and no hard-and-fast category can be prescribed.

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

16. Further, in the case of ***Narinder Singh and Others. Versus State of Punjab and Another, (2014) 6 SCC 466***, the Supreme Court has laid down guidelines for the High Courts while accepting settlement deeds between the parties and quashing the 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



2026:DHC:8977



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. It is to be noted that this Court in the case of ***Deepak Kumar Versus State (Govt. of NCT) of Delhi and Another., 2024 SCC OnLine Del 1305***, while quashing an FIR on the basis of settlement between the parties, held as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

6. Petitioner in the present case seeks to invoke the powers under Section 482 of Code of Criminal Procedure. The same is to be used to secure the ends of justice or to prevent the abuse of process of any Court. In which cases, the power to quash the criminal proceedings or the complaint or FIR may be used when the offender as well as victim have settled their dispute, would depend upon the facts and circumstances of each case and no generalised list or categories can be prescribed. However, the Court is required to give



2026:DHC:8977



due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence and consider the impact on the society.

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

18. Accordingly, considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, *FIR No. 514/2017*, dated 04th October, 2017, registered at PS Karawal Nagar, North-East, Delhi, under Sections 323/342/34 of the IPC, and the proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

19. However, considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, and the fact that the FIR in question is of the year 2017, the petitioners are directed to deposit a sum of Rs. 30,000/- as cost, payable to the Delhi High Court Bar Clerk’s Association, within a period of two weeks, from today. The details of the said Association are as follows:

Delhi High Court Bar Clerk’s Association

Account No. 15530100006282

IFSC Code: UCBA0001553

Bank Name: UCO Bank

Branch: Delhi High Court

20. The proof of cost shall be placed before this Court, as well as with the concerned IO/Station House Officer (“SHO”).

21. The present petition, along with the pending application, is accordingly allowed and disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

OCTOBER 6, 2026/SK