



\$~96

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

% *Date of Decision: 6<sup>th</sup> April, 2026*

+ CRL.M.C. 2419/2025

GOPAL ALIAS LALA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. G.S. Sharma with Mr. V.K. Sharma and Mr. R.A. Sharma, Advocates.

versus

STATE (GNCT OF DELHI) THROUGH SHO & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for the State with ASI Pawan Kumar, PS Paschim Vihar East.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner herein seeks quashing of FIR No.190/2024 dated 11.03.2024, registered at Police Station Paschim Vihar East, for commission of offence under Section 307 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. Charge-sheet has already been filed and charges have also been framed and the case is at the stage of Prosecution Evidence.
3. The concerned injured i.e. Puneet @ Happy (respondent No.3 herein) is, however, yet to enter into witness box.
4. Fact, however, remains that during the pendency of the abovesaid criminal case, the parties have entered into mutual settlement on 21.03.2025. The terms of the settlement have been reduced in writing and based on such settlement, the present petition has been filed, which seeks quashing of FIR.



5. When the present matter was taken up by the learned Joint Registrar (Judicial) on 08.04.2025, it recorded statements of the petitioner as well as of the concerned injured and in his such statement, the injured had claimed that the matter had been amicably settled and that such settlement had been arrived at, without any force, coercion, undue influence and pressure and that he did not want to pursue FIR in view of such settlement. He was also duly identified by the Investigating Officer Sh. Chandan Paswan, at the time of recording of such statement.

6. Respondent No.3 Sh. Puneet @ Happy is present today also and reiterates the terms of the settlement. His affidavit is also on record in which he has, categorically, deposed that he would have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed. He also submits that the parents of the accused have already borne the expenditure on his medical treatment and since they all are residing in the same area, he has resolved the disputes amicably and does not want to pursue with the abovesaid FIR.

7. Respondent No.2 Rohit @ Kaku is also present. The present FIR was registered on the basis of his complaint and he also submits that he would have no objection if the FIR in question is quashed.

8. ASI Pawan Kumar is present and identifies the complainant and the injured.

9. Petitioner is hardly 22 years of age and, according to petitioner, his brother used to consume liquor with the complainant and his friends and when he had gone to advise them, a quarrel and scuffle took place on account of some misunderstanding. The petitioner, who does not have any past history of any nature whatsoever assures that he would not indulge in any criminal activity in future and is apologetic for his act and conduct.



10. Undoubtedly, the allegations are grave but at the same time, the Court cannot be oblivious of the young age of the petitioner and his clean antecedents. Moreover, the settlement has been arrived at without any threat or influence and the parties are also residents of the same neighbourhood and, therefore, in order to maintain such relationship in future, the respondents are not interested in pursuing with the present FIR.

11. The power of the Court under Section 528 BNSS (corresponding Section 482 Cr.P.C.) extends to quashing offences which are non-compoundable on grounds of settlement between victim/complainant and accused/offender. Fact, however, remains that such power is to be exercised with caution. Reference be made to *Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*: (2014) 6 SCC 466, a case which also relates to Section 307 IPC, wherein the Apex Court had observed that proceedings, even in non-compoundable cases, can be quashed on the basis of settlement provided that the Court is satisfied that there was no meaningful purpose in continuing with the proceedings. Reference in this regard be also made to *Naushey Ali vs. State of U.P.*: (2025) 4 SCC 78 wherein also in a case of attempted murder, it was held that when the parties have amicably resolved the dispute, going ahead with the proceedings would be futile and ends of justice require that settlement should be considered in order to quash the proceedings.

12. Keeping in mind the overall facts of the case and the fact that parties have amicably settled their all disputes, continuing with criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose. In any case, even the complainant does not wish to press any charges against the petitioner.

13. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under



Section 528 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

14. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No.190/2024 dated 11.03.2024, registered at Police Station Paschim Vihar East, for commission of offence under Section 307 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is quashed subject to petitioner's depositing cost of Rs. 20,000/- with *Delhi High Court Staff Welfare Fund* [Account no. 15530110074442: IFSC UCBA0001553] within four weeks from today. Proof of deposit of cost and *Compromise Deed* and original affidavits of the parties be submitted before the learned Trial Court within further two weeks.

15. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

**(MANOJ JAIN)**  
**JUDGE**

**APRIL 06, 2026/st/js**