$~65

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

% ***Date of Decision: 19th November, 2026***

\# **CNR No. DLHC010485832026**

\+ CRL.M.C. 7575/2026

ALAMPREET SINGH CHHABRA .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rahul Sharma, Mr. Amit Nayyar and Mr. Sunil Kumar, Advs. with petitioner in person

versus

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

Through: Mr. Ajay Vikram Singh, APP
M: 9868632122
SI Rajni Kumari, PS Hari Nagar
Mr. Gaganmeet Singh Sachdeva, Mr. Harpreet Chawla, Mr. Harshpreet Singh Chadha and Ms. Saiyyada, Advs. for R-2 with R-2 in person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

MINI PUSHKARNA, J. *(Oral):*

1. The present petition has been filed under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 ("BNSS"), seeking quashing of the First Information Report ("FIR") being *FIR No. 626/2021* dated 30th January, 2021, registered at Police Station ("PS") Hari Nagar, West District, Delhi, under Sections 376/406/506 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 ("IPC"), and all the proceedings emanating therefrom, on the ground of settlement.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:HARIOM SHARMA
Signing Date:21.11.2026
10:09:49

2. The petitioner and respondent no. 2 are present before this Court, and are duly identified by their respective counsels as well as the Investigating Officer ("IO"), who is also present before this Court.

3. The present petition is taken up for disposal with the consent of the parties.

4. Learned counsels appearing for the petitioner and respondent no. 2 jointly inform this Court that the parties have already settled the matter by executing a Settlement Agreement dated 02nd September, 2026.

5. This Court is informed that in terms of the said Settlement Agreement, a sum of Rs. 15,50,000/- was to be paid by the petitioner to respondent no. 2, of which a sum of Rs. 10,00,000/- has already been paid.

6. A further sum of Rs. 5,50,000/- has been paid to respondent no. 2 today by way of Demand Draft dated 17th November, 2026, bearing *No. 503941*, drawn on ICICI Bank, which has duly been accepted by her.

7. Learned counsel appearing for the respondent no. 2 submits that respondent no. 2 has already married another person on 08th December, 2024.

8. He, thus, submits that respondent no. 2 does not wish to pursue the present matter any further.

9. This Court has interacted with respondent no. 2, who submits that she herself had uploaded her bio data to the website, namely, Jeevansathi.com.

10. On a pointed query by this Court, respondent no. 2 has categorically submitted that her parents were never involved in uploading her bio data on the said website, and that she contacted the petitioner through her account on the website, and was in a relationship with him for some time.

11. She further submits that since she has already married, and is now living happily with some other person, she does not wish to pursue the present

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:HARIOM SHARMA
Signing Date:21.11.2026
10:09:49

matter any further and wishes to move on in life.

12. In light of the aforesaid, the parties seek quashing of the present FIR.

13. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor ("APP") appearing for the State submits that in view of the facts and circumstances of the present case, the State has no serious objection to the present petition.

14. Having heard the learned counsels appearing for the parties, this Court notes that the parties have arrived at a settlement in respect of the present matter.

15. It is well settled that the High Courts may exercise their inherent powers under Section 528 of the BNSS to quash criminal proceedings, even with respect to non-compoundable offences, if the concerned parties have arrived at a compromise or settlement, and particularly when no overarching public interest is adversely affected by quashing the same. The ultimate guiding factors in such cases must be to secure the ends of justice and prevent the abuse of the process of law.

16. In this regard, reliance is placed upon the case of ***Gian Singh Versus State of Punjab and Another, (2012) 10 SCC 303***, wherein the Supreme Court has held as under:

> *"xxx xxx xxx*
>
> ***58. Where the High Court quashes a criminal proceeding having regard to the fact that the dispute between the offender and the victim has been settled although the offences are not compoundable, it does so as in its opinion, continuation of criminal proceedings will be an exercise in futility and justice in the case demands that the dispute between the parties is put to an end and peace is restored; securing the ends of justice being the ultimate guiding factor.*** *No doubt, crimes are acts which have harmful effect on the public and consist in wrongdoing that seriously endangers and threatens the well-being of the society and it is not safe to leave the crime-doer only because he and the*

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:HARIOM SHARMA
Signing Date:21.11.2026
10:09:49

victim have settled the dispute amicably or that the victim has been paid compensation, yet certain crimes have been made compoundable in law, with or without the permission of the court. ***In respect of serious offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc., or other offences of mental depravity under IPC or offences of moral turpitude under special statutes, like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity, the settlement between the offender and the victim can have no legal sanction at all. However, certain offences which overwhelmingly and predominantly bear civil flavour having arisen out of civil, mercantile, commercial, financial, partnership or such like transactions or the offences arising out of matrimony, particularly relating to dowry, etc. or the family dispute, where the wrong is basically to the victim and the offender and the victim have settled all disputes between them amicably, irrespective of the fact that such offences have not been made compoundable, the High Court may within the framework of its inherent power, quash the criminal proceeding or criminal complaint or FIR if it is satisfied that on the face of such settlement, there is hardly any likelihood of the offender being convicted and by not quashing the criminal proceedings, justice shall be casualty and ends of justice shall be defeated.*** *The above list is illustrative and not exhaustive. Each case will depend on its own facts and no hard-and-fast category can be prescribed.*

xxx xxx xxx"

(Emphasis Supplied)

17. Further, in ***Parbatbhai Aahir Alias Parbatbhai Bhimsinhbhai Karmur and Others Versus State of Gujarat and Another, (2017) 9 SCC 641***, the Supreme Court has summarised the following principles for quashing of criminal proceedings:

"xxx xxx xxx

16. The broad principles which emerge from the precedents on the subject, may be summarised in the following propositions:
16.1. Section 482 preserves the inherent powers of the High Court to prevent an abuse of the process of any court or to secure the ends of justice. The provision does not confer new powers. It only recognises and preserves powers which inhere in the High Court.

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:HARIOM SHARMA
Signing Date:21.11.2026
10:09:49

16.2. The invocation of the jurisdiction of the High Court to quash a first information report or a criminal proceeding on the ground that a settlement has been arrived at between the offender and the victim is not the same as the invocation of jurisdiction for the purpose of compounding an offence. ***While compounding an offence, the power of the court is governed by the provisions of Section 320 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973. The power to quash under Section 482 is attracted even if the offence is non-compoundable.***

16.3. In forming an opinion whether a criminal proceeding or complaint should be quashed in exercise of its jurisdiction under Section 482, the High Court must evaluate whether the ends of justice would justify the exercise of the inherent power.

16.4. While the inherent power of the High Court has a wide ambit and plenitude it has to be exercised (i) to secure the ends of justice, or (ii) to prevent an abuse of the process of any court.

16.5. The decision as to whether a complaint or first information report should be quashed on the ground that the offender and victim have settled the dispute, revolves ultimately on the facts and circumstances of each case and no exhaustive elaboration of principles can be formulated.

16.6. In the exercise of the power under Section 482 and while dealing with a plea that the dispute has been settled, the High Court must have due regard to the nature and gravity of the offence. Heinous and serious offences involving mental depravity or offences such as murder, rape and dacoity cannot appropriately be quashed though the victim or the family of the victim have settled the dispute. Such offences are, truly speaking, not private in nature but have a serious impact upon society. The decision to continue with the trial in such cases is founded on the overriding element of public interest in punishing persons for serious offences.

16.7. As distinguished from serious offences, there may be criminal cases which have an overwhelming or predominant element of a civil dispute. They stand on a distinct footing insofar as the exercise of the inherent power to quash is concerned.

16.8. Criminal cases involving offences which arise from commercial, financial, mercantile, partnership or similar transactions with an essentially civil flavour may in appropriate situations fall for quashing where parties have settled the dispute.

16.9. In such a case, the High Court may quash the criminal

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:HARIOM SHARMA
Signing Date:21.11.2026
10:09:49

proceeding if in view of the compromise between the disputants, the possibility of a conviction is remote and the continuation of a criminal proceeding would cause oppression and prejudice; and
xxx xxx xxx"

(Emphasis Supplied)

18. As regards the quashing of proceedings in serious offences, such as the offence under Section 376 of the IPC, the Supreme Court has cautioned against quashing, while also recognising that the High Court is not entirely deprived of its discretion and that each case must be evaluated on its own facts and circumstances.

19. Reference may be made to the case of ***Madhukar and Others Versus State of Maharashtra and Another, 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1415***, wherein, it has been held that although offences under Section 376 of the IPC are of grave and heinous nature, the Courts are empowered to quash FIRs under the said Section to secure the ends of justice in terms of the facts and circumstances of each case. The relevant excerpt of the said judgment reads as under:

"xxx xxx xxx

6. At the outset, we recognise that the offence under Section 376 IPC is undoubtedly of a grave and heinous nature. Ordinarily, quashing of proceedings involving such offences on the ground of settlement between the parties is discouraged and should not be permitted lightly. However, the power of the Court under Section 482 CrPC to secure the ends of justice is not constrained by a rigid formula and must be exercised with reference to the facts of each case.

xxx xxx xxx"

20. Considering the facts of the present case, and the statement made by respondent no. 2 before this Court, no impediment is found in allowing the present petition. However, it is to be noted that the present FIR has been pending since the year 2021, and the machinery of the State has already been

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:HARIOM SHARMA
Signing Date:21.11.2026
10:09:49

set in motion and utilized over a prolonged period.

21. Accordingly, it is directed that the petitioner shall pay a cost of Rs. 20,000/- to the Bar Council of Delhi Indigent and Disabled Lawyers Fund ("BCDIDL").

22. The bank account details of the BCDIDL are provided below:

Bar Council of Delhi Indigent and Disabled Lawyers Fund
A/c No.: 010104000183451
IFSC Code: IBKL0000010
Bank: IBDI Bank, Siri Fort – Khel Gaon, Delhi

23. Let the said cost be paid, within a period of two weeks, from today.

24. Accordingly, subject to the payment of the aforesaid cost, *FIR No. 626/2021* dated 30th January, 2021, registered at PS Hari Nagar, West District, Delhi, under Sections 376/407/506 of the IPC, and all the proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

25. The present petition is allowed and disposed of in the aforesaid terms.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

NOVEMBER 19, 2026/KR

Signature Not Verified
Digitally Signed
By:HARIOM SHARMA
Signing Date:21.11.2026
10:09:49