



\$~41

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

% **Date of Decision: 09th October, 2026**

CNR No. DLHC010488682026

+ **CRL.M.C. 7617/2026 & CRL.M.A. 31799/2026**

RAVI KUMAR

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. C.S. Yadav and Mr. H.K. Yadav,
Advvs. with petitioner in person

versus

THE STATE (GNCTD) & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sauraj Yadav, Ms. Pratibha Yadav
and Ms. Bhaskar Yadav, Advvs. for. R-
2, with R-2 in person
M: 8448924500

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"), corresponding to Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 ("CrPC"), seeking quashing of the First Information Report ("FIR") being *FIR No. 270/2019* dated 06th June, 2019, registered at Police Station ("PS") Shalimar Bagh, North West District, Delhi, under Sections 363/366 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ("IPC"), along with all proceedings arising therefrom, on the ground of settlement.
2. Issue notice. Notice is accepted by learned Additional Public Prosecutor ("APP") appearing for the State, i.e., respondent no. 1, as well as by learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2.



3. The petitioner and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court, and are duly identified by their respective counsels as well as the concerned Investigating Officer (“IO”), who is also present before this Court.
4. The captioned petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of the parties.
5. As per the material on record, the relevant facts for adjudication of the captioned petition are as under:
 - 5.1. *FIR No. 270/2019* came to be registered at the instance of the father of respondent no. 2, alleging that respondent no. 2, who was 16 years of age at the time, had left her house without informing anyone. Despite efforts to locate her, she could not be found, leading to concerns that she had been kidnapped.
 - 5.2. In connection with the aforesaid FIR, the petitioner was arrested on 11th June, 2019, and placed in judicial custody. He was subsequently granted bail *vide* order dated 18th July, 2019, passed by the Additional Sessions Judge-03, North West, Rohini Courts, New Delhi, with a condition that he would not contact respondent no. 2.
 - 5.3. Approximately one year thereafter, respondent no. 2 voluntarily approached the petitioner, and they began living together.
 - 5.4. Presently, the proceedings arising from the FIR are pending before the Judicial Magistrate First Class-07, North West, Rohini Courts, New Delhi, in *Cr. Case 7150/2023*, and are next listed for hearing on 28th November, 2026.
6. The petitioner and respondent no. 2 jointly submit that they have already settled their dispute, resumed cohabitation, and are living their matrimonial life happily.
7. This Court is informed that the petitioner is currently 24 years of age,



while respondent no. 2 is 22 years of age.

8. This Court is further informed that the petitioner and respondent no. 2 also have two children, i.e., one boy and one girl.

9. Upon interaction with respondent no. 2, she affirms that she is now living happily with the petitioner.

10. Learned APP appearing for the State submits that in view of the facts and circumstances of the case, the State has no serious objection if the present petition is allowed.

11. The Supreme Court has held that under Section 528 of the BNSS, High Courts may quash criminal proceedings, even with respect to non-compoundable offences, where the concerned parties have arrived at a compromise or settlement, and if doing so would prevent abuse of the process of the Court or secure the ends of justice.

12. In ***Parbatbhai Aahir Alias Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and Others Versus State of Gujarat and Another, (2017) 9 SCC 641***, the Supreme Court summarised the following principles for quashing of criminal proceedings:

“xxx xxx xxx

16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:

16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

*16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. **While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of***



Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

13. This Court notes that the petitioner and respondent no. 2 are almost of



the same age, with an age gap of only two years. They also have two children and are presently living together.

14. In these circumstances, continuation of the criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose and may disrupt their family life. Quashing the proceedings would, therefore, secure the ends of justice.

15. Thus, considering the facts and circumstances of the present case, this Court finds no impediment in allowing the present petition.

16. Accordingly, the *FIR No. 270/2019* dated 06th June, 2019, registered at PS Shalimar Bagh, North West District, Delhi, under Sections 363/366 of the IPC, along with the proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby quashed.

17. The present petition is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

18. The pending application also stands disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

OCTOBER 9, 2026/KR