



2026:DHC:885

\$~60

\* IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI

% *Date of Decision: 2<sup>nd</sup> February, 2026*

+ CRL.M.C. 878/2026&CRL.M.A. 3498/2026  
PRADEEP KANOJIA .....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishabh Yadav, Advocate.  
versus

STATE OF NCT OF DELHI AND ORS .....Respondent

Through: Mr. Raj Kumar, APP with SI  
Satyapreet.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**  
**JUDGMENT (oral)**

1. The present petition seeks quashing of FIR No. 586/2025 dated 12.09.2025, registered at Police Station Kalindi Kunj, for commission of offences under Sections 118(1)/3(5) of the BNS, 2023 (corresponding Section 324/34 IPC) and all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, on the basis of compromise arrived at between the parties.
2. Injuries were received by respondent No.2-Monu who is present in Court.
3. Though the injuries were simple in nature, since these were on vital parts of the body, the chargesheet was, eventually, filed under Sections 109(1)/3(5) BNS (corresponding Sections 307 /34 IPC).
4. It is apprised that the learned Trial Court has already framed charges on 30.01.2026.
5. Learned APP for the State, however, also submits that, initially, the police was able to apprehend one juvenile offender as well as one Mr. Pradeep Kanojia (petitioner No.1 herein). However, the third accused i.e. Jaideep



2026:DHC:885  
A square QR code located in the top right corner of the page.

Kanojia remained absconding and, therefore, the chargesheet could not be filed against him.

6. Admittedly, petitioner No.3 Jaideep Kanojia has also filed an application seeking anticipatory bail BAIL APPLN. 412/2026 which is also listed for hearing today.

7. IO is present and identifies respondent No.2 Monu.

8. During course of arguments, it was also apprised that earlier, respondent No.2 had been arrested for committing murder of brother of petitioner No.1 –Pradeep Kanojia and the incident in question had taken place after respondent No.2 was acquitted in said murder case.

9. Fact remains that both the sides have entered into settlement and have placed on record copy of settlement deed.

10. Respondent No.2 submits that he has already received compensation of Rs. 6,00,000/-.

11. Petitioners are also present in Court and undertake not to indulge in such type of activities in future.

12. 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.



2026:DHC:885  
A QR code located in the top right corner of the page.

13. 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.

14. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, continuing with criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose, especially, when dispute does not involve any substantial public interest and is, primarily, private in nature. In any case, even the complainant does not wish to press any charges against the petitioners.

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

14. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No. 586/2025 dated 12.09.2025, registered at Police Station Kalindi Kunj, for commission of offences under Sections 118(2)/3(5) of the BNS, 2023, which was later on converted to offences under Section 109(1)/3(5) (corresponding Section 324/34 IPC, converted offences under Section 307/34 IPC), along with all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, is hereby, quashed, subject to each petitioner depositing cost of Rs. 25,000/- with *Delhi High Court Staff Welfare Fund* [Account no. 15530110074442: IFSC UCBA0001553] within two weeks from today.

16. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

17. Pending application also stands disposed of.

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

**FEBRUARY 2, 2026/sw/pb**