



\$~85

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

% ***Date of Decision: 16th March, 2026***

+ **CRL.M.C. 1883/2026 & CRL.M.A. 7741-7742/2026**

LAVANYA CHADHA AND ANRPetitioners

Through: Mr. Anshuj Dhingra with
Ms. Akansha Sharma, Advocates with
petitioner No.1 in person and
petitioner No.2 through V.C.

versus

STATE GOVERNMENT OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr. Aashneet Singh, APP for
State with SI Madal Pal, PS Domestic
Airport.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of FIR No. 80009660 dated 03.02.2026, registered at police station Palam Domestic Airport/e-Police Station for commission of offence under Section 303(2) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita* (BNS), 2023 (corresponding Section 379 of IPC) along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. Petitioner No.1 is the alleged accused whereas petitioner No.2 happens to be the complainant.
3. As per prosecution's story, petitioner No.1, along with her one friend Ishika Makkar, had taken a flight from Delhi to Bangalore on 29.01.2026.



After completing frisking and security screening process, she picked up *AirPods* under the impression that it was her *AirPods* as her sister owned the one. According to her, on account of identical appearance of such pods, she could not comprehend that such pods, in fact, belonged to petitioner No.2.

4. Petitioner No.2 was also travelling, *albeit*, from Delhi to Mumbai and since he found his *AirPods* missing, he sought assistance from the airport security and, eventually, was able to locate his such *AirPods*, being in use elsewhere and that was how the Investigating Agency was able to reach petitioner No.1 and booked her for committing theft.

5. The *AirPods* in question were also seized and at the time of alleged seizure, *AirPods* were also duly identified by petitioner No.2.

6. Learned counsel for petitioner No.1 submits that it is a case of *bona fide* error and there was never any intention to commit theft and the abovesaid *AirPods* were picked up by petitioner No.1, out of sheer inadvertence.

7. Learned Addl. P.P. for the State appears on advance notice. The Investigating Officer is also present.

8. The broad factual aspects are not disputed.

9. Learned Addl. P.P. for the State submits that it does not seem to be a case of inadvertence picking up of *AirPods* and perhaps the intention of the petitioner No.1 was other than *bona fide*. He, however, submits that the investigation is though over, charge-sheet has yet not been filed.

10. Petitioner No.1 is a young girl, who has completed her course of interior designing and is employed in Delhi. She has a bright future ahead.

11. During course of the arguments today, she, while acknowledging her conduct, admitted that she should have cross-checked everything before picking up the *AirPods* in question. Petitioner No.2, who has also joined the



proceedings through *video-conferencing*, submits that he would have no objection if the present FIR is quashed as the matter has been amicably settled and since petitioner No.1 has expressed her apology, he has forgiven her and does not want to pursue present FIR.

12. IO has identified the parties.

13. Evidently, in view of aforesaid, no useful purpose would be served by keeping this case alive, particularly, when the offence in question is, even otherwise, compoundable in nature.

14. 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.

15. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No. 80009660 dated 03.02.2026, registered at police station Palam Domestic Airport/e-Police Station for commission of offence under Section 303(2) of *Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023* (corresponding Section 379 of IPC), along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, quashed.

16. The *AirPods* in question may be, unconditionally, returned to petitioner No.2.

17. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

18. Pending applications also stand disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

MARCH 16, 2026/st/js