



2025:DHC:10385



\$~36

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

% *Date of Decision: 17th November, 2025*

+ **CRL.M.C. 1249/2025 & CRL.M.A. 5624/2025**

SAHIL GUPTA & ANR.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Sahil Gupta and Mr.
Arpit Gupta, Advocates
along with petitioners in
person.

versus

STATE THROUGH SHO PS BINDAPUR
AND ORS & ORS.Respondents
Through: Mr. Rajkumar, APP for
the State with SI Priyanka
Saini, PS Bindapur.
Mr. Ashish Dutt,
Advocate for R-2 & 3

**CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN**

AMIT MAHAJAN, J. (ORAL)

1. The present petition is filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 80/2024 dated 23.02.2024, registered at Police Station Bindapur, for offences under Sections 354/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ('**IPC**') and Section 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences Act, 2012 ('**POCSO Act**'), including the proceedings emanating therefrom. The Chargesheet in the present case has been filed.

2. The Respondent No. 2/Complainant and the petitioners are residents of the same building. The FIR was registered at the behest of Respondent No. 2, alleging that on 22.02.2024, at



2025:DHC:10385



around 3 PM, the victim was pulled inside a car by both the petitioners and they started touching her inappropriately. When the uncle and aunt of the victim came to rescue her, the petitioners inflicted injuries upon them as well. Consequently, the aforementioned FIR was registered.

3. The present petition has been filed on the ground that the parties have settled their disputes by way of Memorandum of Understanding dated 08.01.2025, out of their free will, without any pressure, coercion or undue influence.

4. The no objection of the complainant through her father, to quashing of the FIR and the proceedings emanating therefrom, was recorded *vide* order dated 12.09.2025 of this Court. It was further stated that the parties are neighbors and are maintaining good relations. It was also stated that the complaint was given on a misunderstanding which has since been realized by the victim and thus, the disputes have been settled *vide* the Memorandum of Understanding 08.01.2025.

5. By the same order, the victim was exempted from appearing personally on the next date of hearing.

6. The other victims, the Uncle and Aunt of child-victim, are present in court and have stated that they have also resolved their disputes with the petitioners.

7. The parties have duly been identified by the Investigating Officer.

8. It is stated that the parties are known to each other and want to live their lives peacefully and that they have no objection in quashing of the present FIR.



9. Offences under Section 354 of the IPC and Section 8 of the POCSO Act are non-compoundable.

10. It is well settled that the High Court while exercising its powers under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ('BNSS') (erstwhile Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973) can compound offences which are non-compoundable on the ground that there is a compromise between the accused and the complainant. The Hon'ble Apex Court has laid down parameters and guidelines for High Court while accepting settlement and quashing the proceedings.

11. In *Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.* : (2014) 6 SCC 466, the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under :-

“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.”

(emphasis supplied)

12. Similarly, in *Parbatbhai Aahir & Ors v. State of Gujarat & Anr. : (2017) 9 SCC 641*, the Hon'ble Apex Court has observed as under :-

“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

16.10. There is yet an exception to the principle set out in propositions 16.8. and 16.9. above. Economic offences involving the financial and economic well-being of the State have implications which lie beyond the domain of a mere dispute between private disputants. The High Court would be justified in declining to quash where the offender is involved in an activity akin to a financial or economic fraud or misdemeanour. The consequences of the act complained of upon the financial or economic system will weigh in the balance.”

(emphasis supplied)

13. The Hon'ble Apex Court, in ***Kapil Gupta: 2022 SCC Online SC 1030***, while quashing an FIR under Section 376 of the IPC, had observed as under:

“12. It can thus be seen that this Court has clearly held that though the Court should be slow in



*quashing the proceedings wherein heinous and serious offences are involved, the High Court is not foreclosed from examining as to whether there exists material for incorporation of such an offence or as to whether there is sufficient evidence which if proved would lead to proving the charge for the offence charged with. **The Court has also to take into consideration as to whether the settlement between the parties is going to result into harmony between them which may improve their mutual relationship.***

X-X-X

*15. In both the cases, though the charge-sheets have been filed, the charges are yet to be framed and as such, the trial has not yet commenced. **It is further to be noted that since Respondent 2 herself is not supporting the prosecution case, even if the criminal trial is permitted to go ahead, it will end in nothing else than an acquittal. If the request of the parties is denied, it will be amounting to only adding one more criminal case to the already overburdened criminal courts.***

(emphasis supplied)

14. Undisputedly, the offences under Section 354 of the IPC and Section 8 of the POCSO Act are heinous in nature and involve mental depravity. Offences of such nature cannot be quashed merely because the victim has settled the dispute. Such offences, in true sense, cannot be said to be offences in personam as the same are crimes against the society.

15. In the present case, as noted above, victim was a minor at the time of the alleged offence. Even though the chargesheet has already been filed, but keeping in view the facts of the case, this Court feels that no useful purpose will be served by keeping the dispute alive. The parties have a long life ahead, thus, a humanitarian approach is required to be taken in such peculiar facts. Continuance of the proceedings would amount to abuse of



2025:DHC:10385



the process of Court and hence, I am of the considered opinion that this is a fit case to exercise extraordinary discretionary jurisdiction under Section 528 of BNSS.

16. However, keeping in mind the fact that the State machinery has been put to motion, ends of justice would be served if the petitioners are put to cost.

17. In view of the above, FIR No. 80/2024 and all consequential proceedings arising therefrom are quashed, subject to payment of cost of ₹30,000/- by the petitioners to be deposited with the Delhi Police Welfare Society, within a period of four weeks from date.

18. Let the proof of deposit of cost be submitted to the concerned SHO.

19. The present petition is allowed in the aforesaid terms. Pending application(s), if any, also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

NOVEMBER 17, 2025/DU