



2025:DHC:8021



\$~23

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

%

Date of decision: 11.09.2025

+

CRL.M.C. 1364/2024

JASPAL SINGH KHOKAR &amp; ORS. ....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Siddharth Yadav, Sr. Adv.  
with Mr. Narender, Adv.

versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI &amp; ANR .....Respondents

Through: Ms. Manjeet Arya with Insp. B  
M Bahuguna and SI Dhanjay  
Gupta, PS Kirti Nagar.  
Mr. Sanjay S. Chhabra, Mr.  
Satish Choudhary, Advs. for R-  
2.**CORAM:-****HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE RAVINDER DUDEJA****JUDGMENT(ORAL)****RAVINDER DUDEJA, J.**

1. This is a petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, seeking quashing of FIR No.154/2009, dated 09.06.2009, registered at P.S Kirti Nagar, Delhi under section 420/467/471/506/120B IPC and all proceedings emanating therefrom on the basis of settlement between the parties.

2. As per allegations made in the FIR, complainant (since deceased), co-owner of property C-1/9, Rajouri Garden, alleged that petitioners fraudulently forged documents, including a false will and



2025:DHC:8021



gift deed, to illegally grab the property which originally belonged to their late mother, Prem Kaur, who died intestate. He further states that despite partition proceedings pending before this court, the petitioners threatened him and his wife with dispossession and creating nuisance. Thereafter, complainant filed FIR No. 154/2009, dated 09.06.2009, at P.S Kirti Nagar, Delhi under sections 420/467/471/ 506/120B IPC against the petitioners.

3. During the proceedings, the parties amicably resolved their disputes and executed the terms of settlement in writing by a Settlement Agreement dated 10.02.2024. In view of the aforesaid settlement 45% share of the property bearing no. C-1/9, Rajouri Garden, New Delhi is in favour of complainant and remaining 55% in favour of petitioner no. 3 with others renouncing all claims over the property and undertake never to assert any rights. It is further submitted that the abovementioned property shall be sold in the open market to the highest bidder with sale negotiations, execution must be through joint participation of parties and the entire sale consideration shall be received at one time on execution of the Sale Deed, not by bayana (advance) or part payment, unless mutually agreed in writing. It is further submitted that after sale and receipt of full consideration, the respondent no. 2 and petitioner no. 3 shall jointly pay Rs. 1 crore each to the persons named in the settlement, within 1–2 weeks of sale completion. Copy of the settlement Agreement has been annexed as Annexure P-9.



4. It is submitted that during the pendency of the proceedings complainant (deceased respondent no. 2) passed away and thus he is being represented by his legal heirs. The copy of the amended memo of parties has also been placed on record in this regards.

5. Wife of respondent no. 2 and petitioners are physically present before the Court while daughters of respondent no. 2 have entered their appearance through VC. They have been identified by their respective counsels as well as by the Investigating Officer SI Dhanjay Gupta, from PS Kirti Nagar

6. Respondents confirm that the matter has been amicably settled with the petitioners without any force, fear, coercion and they have no objection if the FIR No. 154/2009 is quashed against the Petitioners.

7. In view of the settlement between the parties, learned Additional PP appearing for the State, also has no objection if the present FIR No. 154/2009 is quashed.

8. In *Gian Singh vs State of Punjab (2012) 10 SCC 303*, Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

"61. In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the



affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceedings."

9. Further, it is settled that the inherent powers under section 482 of the Code are required to be exercised to secure the ends of justice or to prevent abuse of the process of any court. Further, the High Court can quash non-compoundable offences after considering the nature of the offence and the amicable settlement between the concerned parties. Reliance may be placed upon *B.S. Joshi v. State of Haryana, (2003) 4 SCC 675*.

10. In view of the aforesaid circumstances and the fact that parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 154/2009, dated 09.06.2009, registered at P.S Kirti Nagar, Delhi under sections 420/467/471/506/120B IPC and all the other consequential proceeding emanating therefrom.

11. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 154/2009, dated 09.06.2009, registered at P.S Kirti Nagar, Delhi under sections 420/467/471/506/120B IPC and all the other consequential proceeding emanating therefrom is hereby quashed.

12. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

13. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

**RAVINDER DUDEJA, J**

**September 11, 2025/SK**