



\$~SB-8&9

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

% *Date of Decision: 30th June, 2025*

+ CRL.M.C. 4133/2025 & CRL.M.A. 18098/2025

FATIMA BASIM JASIMPetitioner

Through: Mr. Vishwajeet Verma, Advocate.

versus

STATE NCT OF DELHI AND ORS.Respondent

Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP with Mr. Siddharth Shankar Jha and Ms. Kalpana Jha, Advocates.
SI Sajid Hussain.

9

+ CRL.M.C. 4135/2025 & CRL.M.A. 18101/2025

MOHD QAMRUL ISLAMPetitioner

Through: Mr. Rashid Azam, Advocate.

versus

STATE AND ORSRespondent

Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP with Mr. Siddharth Shankar Jha and Ms. Kalpana Jha, Advocates.
SI Sajid Hussain.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN

J U D G M E N T (oral)

1. There are two cross-cases.
2. In both the abovesaid cross-cases, separate petitions have been moved seeking quashing of FIRs.
3. Petitioner Ms. Fatima Basim Jasim (in CRL.M.C. 4133/2025) had filed a complaint with the police which led to registration of FIR No. 0386/2023 dated 22.06.2023 under Sections 354, 506, 50, 34 IPC at PS Neb Sarai, New Delhi.



4. The solitary accused in the abovesaid case i.e. Mr. Mohd Qamrul Islam (who is petitioner in CRL.M.C. 4135/2025) had, initially, lodged a complaint with the police which resulted in registration of e-FIR No. 000324/2023 dated 14.03.2023 under Section 379 IPC at PS Saket, New Delhi against Ms. Fatima.
5. Chargesheet has yet not been filed in any of the matters.
6. Fact remains that as per the specific case of Ms. Fatima Basim Jasim, who is, reportedly, citizen of Republic of Iraq and is currently residing in New Delhi, she had come to Delhi on a Student Visa to pursue B.Sc. in Computer Science from the University of Delhi. She submits that the matter has been amicably settled and, therefore, neither she nor Mr. Mohd. Qamrul Islam, want to continue with their respective cases, which were on registered on the basis of their respective complaints.
7. It is submitted that the matter has been amicably settled and the *Memorandum of Understanding* (MoU) has also been placed on record.
8. Such MoU is dated 20.06.2025 which is signed by both the parties and terms of settlement have been reiterated by them before this Court as well.
9. As per the terms of settlement, Ms. Fatima Basim Jasim has even paid a sum of Rs. 50,000/- to Mr. Mohd Qamrul Islam on such date of settlement.
10. Parties are physically present before the Court with their respective advocates. Mr. Vishwajeet Verma and Mr. Rashid Azam, learned counsel for petitioners identify their respective clients.
11. SI Mr. Sajid, PS Neb Sarai has appeared and he also identifies both the



petitioners.

12. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor appears on advance notice and submits that though there is no real urgency in the matter, he leaves it to the court to pass appropriate orders.

13. Ms. Fatima Basim Jasim (petitioner in CRL.M.C. 4133/2025) reiterates that the matter has been amicably resolved and she does not want to pursue her complaint any further. She submits that her career is at stake and she has to exit India immediately, after complying with the Visa requirements as she has to attend to her critically ill mother in Iraq. She supplements that she is eligible for taking admission in M.Sc. Programme and, in case, there is any further delay in the matter, it would jeopardize FRRO compliance, rendering her ineligible for re-entry in India and, consequently she may not even be considered for such M.Sc. Programme.

14. Both the petitioners state before this Court that they both have entered into MoU of their own accord and free will and there is no coercion, pressure or threat. They both have also filed affidavits to said effect.

15. 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."

16. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and the fact that parties have put a quietus to the disputes, no useful purpose would be served by continuing with the present two FIRs (FIR No. 0386/2023 dated 22.06.2023 under Sections 354, 506, 509 34 IPC at PS Neb Sarai, New Delhi in CRL.M.C. 4133/2025 and e-FIR No. 000324/2023 dated 14.03.2023 under Section 379 IPC at PS Saket, New Delhi in CRL.M.C. 4135/2025). Resultantly, both the abovesaid FIRs, along with all the other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, are hereby quashed.

17. Both the petitions are allowed in the aforesaid terms.

18. Pending applications, if any, stand disposed of.

MANOJ JAIN, J
(VACATION JUDGE)

JUNE 30, 2025/sw/SS