



2026:DHC:6328



\$~10

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**% *Date of Decision: 05.08.2026*# **CNR No. DLHC010101652026**+ **CRL.M.C. 1979/2026**

BUDHU @ MURAI LAL AND ORSPetitioners

Through: Mr. Jatin Rajput, Mr. Rajesh Jha and
Ms. Iqra Malik, Advocates.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Amit Ahlawat, APP for State
with SI Sanjay Bansal.**CORAM: JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA****J U D G M E N T (ORAL)**

1. Petitioners seek quashing of case FIR No. 274/2010 of PS Daryaganj for offence under Section 325/326/34 IPC on the ground that complainant *de facto* (*respondent no.2*) has compromised the disputes with the petitioners.

2. At the outset, learned prosecutor submits that the proceedings before the learned trial court already stand culminated and now the matter is fixed for final decision. It is further submitted by learned prosecutor that learned counsel for the present petitioners also participated in the final arguments, so now this petition has become infructuous.



3. On the other hand, learned counsel for petitioners submits that the FIR is of the year 2010, so this inordinate delay in trial in itself is a ground to accept settlement between the parties.

4. This petition came up for the first hearing on 18.03.2026 and following order was passed:

“2. Petitioners seek quashing of case FIR No. 274/2010 of PS Daryaganj for offence under Section 325/34 IPC on the ground that complainant de facto (respondent no.2) has compromised the disputes with the petitioners.

3. Learned APP accepts notice and strongly objects to this petition on the ground that the offence under Section 326 IPC with which the petitioners were charged is punishable with life imprisonment and trial has concluded and is now listed for final arguments.

4. As requested, status report be filed within four weeks.

5. In the meanwhile, it is made clear that there is no stay on the proceedings before the trial court.

6. Relist on 05.08.2026 in Advance List.”

5. It was made clear on 18.03.2026 itself that there shall be no stay on proceedings before the trial court as trial stood culminated. It is in view of the said observation that counsel for petitioners also participated in the final arguments and now the matter is posted for judgment.

6. As pointed out by learned prosecutor, it also is a significant factor that the petitioners were charged with offence under Section 326 IPC, which is punishable with life imprisonment. That in itself is a ground to reject the settlement arrived at between the parties, that too at the fag end of the trial.



2026:DHC:6328



7. In the case of *Narender Singh and Others vs State of Punjab and Another*, (2014) 6 SCC 466, the Supreme Court analyzed the scope of Section 482 CrPC and took a view that where prosecution evidence is almost complete or the matter is at the stage of arguments, the High Court should refrain from exercising its powers under Section 482 of the Code to quash the proceedings on the ground of compromise between the parties. For, in such cases the trial court would be in a better position to decide the case finally and come to a conclusion as to whether the alleged offence was committed or not.

8. The present petition is not just devoid of merits, but completely frivolous, so it is dismissed.

**GIRISH KATHPALIA
(JUDGE)**

AUGUST 05, 2026*/ry*