



2026:DHC:1532



\$~65

*

IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

%

Date of Decision: 19th February, 2026

+

CRL.M.C. 1401/2026 & CRL.M.A. 5625/2026

MRS. LAXMI KAUR & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Devesh Pratap Singh with
Ms. Nidhi Dalal, Advocates with
petitioners in person.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the
State with SI Deepak Dhanda, PS
Govindpuri
Mr. Aakash Bansal, Advocate for
respondent No.2 with respondent
No.2 in person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of FIR No.381/2024 dated 14.07.2024, registered at P.S. Govind Puri, for commission of offences under Sections 420/467/468/471/34 IPC along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. The case is still under investigation and charge-sheet has yet not been filed.
3. Essentially, the dispute is between close family members.
4. The abovesaid FIR was registered on the basis of complaint made by Ms Kalawati, aged around 85 years.
5. In her complaint dated 14.07.2024, she claimed that she was resident of RZ-234, Gali No.18-19, Tughlakabad Extension, New Delhi. She has six sons and three daughters. In the year 2011, her husband was hospitalized



2026:DHC:1532



and since she was busy taking care of her husband, her one son Sh. Jaswant Singh requested her to appoint him as her attorney to manage the abovesaid property. Believing him, she went to the office of sub-Registrar where some documentation was done on 06.09.2011, where few of her family members also signed as witnesses.

6. She, later, learnt that after the appointment of her said son as her attorney, her son executed a gift deed with respect to third floor portion with roof rights in favour of his wife Ms. Laxmi. Her son Jaswant Singh, allegedly, created fake documents by forging her signatures and when she learnt about such fraud, she reported the matter to police.

7. It was in the abovesaid backdrop that she wanted action to be taken against her such son and other family members.

8. Fact remains that besides the abovesaid FIR, three other civil matters were filed which related to the abovesaid property.

9. During pendency of such matters, all the concerned parties have entered into settlement. The settlement has taken place under the aegis of *Mediation Centre, Saket Courts, New Delhi* and the broad terms of settlement are found recorded in Mediation Order dated 08.10.2025.

10. All the petitioners are present physically in Court.

11. Respondent No.2 is present in person with her counsel Sh. Aakash Bansal.

12. The Investigating Officer (I.O.) is also present and identifies her.

13. The terms of settlement have been reiterated by respondent No.2. When a query was put to her, she stated that as per the terms of settlement, the abovesaid property would now be sold and the proceeds would be divided in seven equal shares amongst her six sons and herself. She submits



2026:DHC:1532



that it is also decided that a sum of Rs.2,00,000/- would go to each of her three daughters. She states that on account of pendency of the present criminal matter, they are not able to execute Sale Deed, though, *agreement to sell* has been executed and it is, therefore, prayed that since the matter has been amicably settled, she would have no objection if FIR in question is quashed. She states that she has now no grievance against anyone.

14. The daughter of respondent No.2 Smt. Ravinder Kaur is present. She is also one of the signatories of the MOU and submits that she would take care of the residence-aspect of her mother, for future, once the property is sold.

15. As noted, matter is between very close family members and they all have been able to settle the matter amongst themselves and, therefore, there is no impediment in quashing FIR, when dominant offence is of cheating which is compoundable in nature. Reference be made to *Omprakash Gupta v. State (NCT of Delhi)*: 2020 SCC OnLine Del 2387, wherein Coordinate Bench of this Court, in a petition seeking quashing of matter relating to forgery and fabrication of documents, held that as the dispute between close relatives had been amicably settled prior to filing of charge-sheet, and as the case did not involve any serious offence or societal interest, a liberal approach in terms of *Narinder Singh v. State of Punjab*: 2014 SCC OnLine SC 265 is warranted. Reference is also made to the decision of Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*: (2012) 10 SCC 303 in this context.

16. Keeping in mind the aforesaid, and also in order to facilitate the parties in maintaining and restoring cordiality, the proceedings in the present case deserve to be quashed. In any case, even the complainant does not wish



2026:DHC:1532



to press any charges against the petitioners.

17. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of the BNSS, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

18. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No.381/2024 dated 14.07.2024, registered at P.S. Govind Puri, for commission of offences under Sections 420/467/468/471/34 IPC, along with all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby, quashed subject to petitioners depositing cost of Rs.10,000/- each with Delhi Legal Services Authority (South-East District) within two weeks from today.

19. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

20. Pending application also stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

(MANOJ JAIN)
JUDGE

FEBRUARY 19, 2026/st/js