



2026:DHC:9293



\$~16

* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% Date of Decision: 14th October, 2026

CNR No. DLHC010216672026

+ CRL.M.C. 3764/2026 & CRL.M.A. 15287/2026

MOHIT MUDGAL & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Kavita Jha, Advocate with
petitioners in person.
(M): 8920269201
Email: jhakavita@rediffmail.com

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP for the
State.
(M): 9810442918
Email:
ajayvikramsingh563@gmail.com
Mr. Rambir Singh with Ms. Versha
Sagar and Mr. Pradeep Kumar Gaur,
Advocates for respondent no. 2 with
respondent no. 2 in person.
(M): 9555377734
Email: ram1singh1840@gmail.com
SI Chetan Panwar, PS Chhawla
ASI Mangtu Ram, PS Dwarka, Sector
23

CORAM:**HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA****MINI PUSHKARNA, J. (Oral):**

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya

Signature Not Verified

Digitally Signed
By: HARIOM SHARMA
Signing Date: 15.10.2026
21:14:18



2026:DHC:9293



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. 09/2026* dated 06th January, 2026, registered at Police Station (“PS”) Chhawla, Dwarka, Delhi, under Sections 118(1)/351(2)/3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (“BNS”), 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 petitioners and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court, and are duly identified by their respective counsels as well as the 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 following facts have been culled out:

5.1. On 05th January, 2025, at around 01:00 PM, respondent no. 2 was undertaking accounting work in his office. When he raised the issue of alleged accounting fraud with petitioner nos. 2 and 3, a fight broke out, which led to a scuffle.

5.2. It is alleged that petitioner no. 2 then brandished a knife at respondent no. 2. When respondent no. 2 attempted to escape, his hands were held by petitioner no. 1, i.e., the brother of petitioner no. 2.

5.3. Thereafter, petitioner no. 2 allegedly attacked respondent no. 2 with the knife at the instance of his father, i.e., petitioner no. 3, causing bleeding from the neck of respondent no. 2.

5.4. Upon hearing respondent no. 2 shouting, the father of respondent no. 2



and a few other persons arrived at the spot, following which all three petitioners fled.

5.5. The father of respondent no. 2 subsequently called the police and took respondent no. 2 to the hospital for treatment.

6. The petitioners and respondent no. 2 jointly submit that they have now settled the matter and executed a Memorandum of Understanding dated 15th January, 2026, wherein the parties have agreed to resolve all their claims against each other, and respondent no. 2 agreed to cooperate in quashing the present FIR.

7. This Court has interacted with respondent no. 2, who submits that he has settled the matter and does not wish to pursue the matter any further.

8. Learned APP for the State submits that in view of the fact that the nature of the injury was simple, the petitioners ought to be levied with costs. Otherwise, he has no serious objection to the allowing of the present petition.

9. It was well settled that High Courts exercising their inherent powers under Section 528 of the BNSS, corresponding to Section 482 of the CrPC, may quash criminal proceedings, even for non-compoundable offences, if the concerned parties have arrived at a compromise, and particularly when no overarching public interest is adversely affected by quashing the same. The ultimate guiding factors in such cases must be to secure the ends of justice and prevent the abuse of the process of law.

10. In this regard, reliance is placed upon the case of ***Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and Another, (2012) 10 SCC 303***, wherein the Supreme Court has held as under:

“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)

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



“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)

12. Having heard learned counsels appearing for the parties, and considering the fact that the parties have arrived at a settlement and that respondent no. 2 does not wish to pursue the matter any further, it is directed that *FIR No. 09/2026* dated 06th January, 2026, registered at PS Chhawla, Dwarka, Delhi, under Sections 118(1)/351(2)/3(5) of the BNS, along with the consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby quashed.

13. However, considering the nature of the charges against the petitioners, it is directed that the petitioners shall pay a cost in the sum of Rs. 30,000/- to the Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee (“DHCLSC”).

14. The relevant bank account details of the DHCLSC are as follows:

Name: Delhi High Court Legal Services Committee

A/c No: 15530110008386

Bank: UCO BANK

Branch: Delhi High Court

IFSC: UCBA0001553

15. The aforesaid cost shall be paid, within a period of two weeks, from today.

16. The proof of payment of the cost shall be filed before this Court, as well as with the IO, within a period of one week after deposit of the amount.

17. With the aforesaid directions, the present petition, along with the pending application, is accordingly disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

OCTOBER 14, 2026

c