



IN THE HIGH COURT OF KARNATAKA AT BENGALURU

DATED THIS THE 19TH DAY OF DECEMBER, 2025

BEFORE

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 7927 OF 2025 (482(Cr.PC) /
528(BNSS))

C/W

CRIMINAL PETITION NO. 17243 OF 2025 (482(Cr.PC) /
528(BNSS))

IN CRL.P No. 7927/2025

BETWEEN:

1. GIRIJA B
WIFE OF MR. JAYARAM.H
AGED ABOUT 66 YEARS
RESIDING AT CHELLAMMA KRUPA,
7TH CROSS, GANGOTHRI ROAD,
TUMKUR,
BANGALORE - 572 103.
2. JAYARAM H.C,
SON OF LATE CHALLAIAH,
AGED ABOUT 71 YEARS
RESIDING AT, CHELLAMMA KRUPA,
7TH CROSS, GANGOTHRI ROAD,
GANGOTH, KUVEMPU NAGAR,
TUMKUR,
BANGALORE - 572 103
(AS PER FIR).



(AS PER AADHAR)
H.C. JAYARAMA
S/O LATE CHALLAIAH
01, HUCHAYANADODDI, CHANNAPATNA
TALUKU, VIRUPAKSHIPURA HOBALI
KODAMBALLI, RAMANAGAR
KARNATAKA - 562 138.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SHASHANK NAGENDRAN, ADVOCATE)

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SOUTH EAST WOMEN
POLICE STATION
BENGALURU CITY,
REPRESENTED BY
THE STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT BUILDINGS
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. SMT. PRARTHANA M
WIFE OF SRI. MANJU DARSHAN,
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 154,
4TH MAIN ROAD,
HVR LAYOUT,
BENGALURU - 560 079

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. RAHUL RAI K, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. NAVEEN N, ADVOCATE FOR R2)



THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 482 OF CR.PC (FILED U/S 528 BNNS) PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR IN CR.NO.14/2025 WAS REGISTERED BY THE RESPONDENT POLICE ON 13.03.2025 ON THE BASIS OF A COMPLAINT LODGED BY SMT.PRARTHANA.M THE RESPONDENT NO.2 HEREIN FOR THE OFFENCE P/U/S 85 OF THE BNS AND SEC.3, 4 OF D.P ACT AS AGAINST THE PETITIONERS.

IN CRL.P NO. 17243/2025

BETWEEN:

1. MR. MANJU DARSHAN
SON OF MR. H.C. JAYARAM,
AGED ABOUT 31 YEARS,
RESIDING AT CHALLAMMA KRUPA,
7TH CROSS GANGOTHRI ROAD,
TUMKUR,
BANGALORE - 572 103.
2. MRS. NANDINI CHETAN
WIFE OF MR. CHETAN,
AGED ABOUT 43 YEARS,
RESIDING AT CHALLAMMA KRUPA,
7TH CROSS, GANGOTHRI ROAD,
TUMKUR,
BANGALORE - 572 103.

...PETITIONERS

(BY SRI. SHASHANK NAGENDRAN, ADVOCATE)



NC: 2025:KHC:54596
CRL.P No. 7927 of 2025
C/W CRL.P No. 17243 of 2025

AND:

1. STATE OF KARNATAKA
BY SOUTH EAST WOMEN POLICE STATION,
BENGALURU CITY,
REPRESENTED BY
THE STATE PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT BUILDINGS,
BENGALURU - 560 001.
2. SMT. PRARTHANA M
WIFE OF SRI MANJU DARSHAN,
AGED ABOUT 25 YEARS,
RESIDING AT NO. 154,
4TH MAIN ROAD,
HVR LAYOUT,
BENGALURU.

...RESPONDENTS

(BY SRI. RAHUL RAI K, HCGP FOR R1;
SRI. NAVEEN N, ADVOCATE FOR R2)

THIS CRL.P IS FILED U/S 482 OF CR.P.C (U/S 528 BNSS) PRAYING TO QUASH THE FIR IN CR.NO.14/2025 DTD 13.03.2025 ON THE BASIS OF A COMPLAINT LODGED BY SMT. PRARTHANA.M THE RESPONDENT NO.2 HEREIN, FOR THE OFFENCE P/U/S 85 OF BNS, U/S 3 AND 4 OF D.P ACT AS AGAINST THE PETITIONERS.

THESE PETITIONS, COMING ON FOR ADMISSION, THIS DAY, ORDER WAS MADE THEREIN AS UNDER:

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MOHAMMAD NAWAZ



ORAL ORDER

Both these petitions arise out of FIR in Crime No.14/2025 of South East Women Police Station, registered on a complaint lodged by respondent No.2.

2. FIR is registered for the offences punishable under Section 85 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNS, 2023') and under Section 3 and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 (for short 'D.P.Act').

3. Applications are filed in both petitions to permit the parties to compound the offence on the ground of settlement and to quash the proceedings. Applications are accompanied with the joint affidavits of the parties. It is stated that the parties have resolved their differences amicably and respondent No.2/defacto complainant has compromised the matter in terms of mediation/settlement/agreement.

4. It is necessary to extract Paragraph Nos.1 to 6 of the joint affidavit, which reads as under:



"1. We, the Deponents No. 01 and 02 are the Petitioners and the Respondent No. 02 in the above Petition respectively. We are well conversant with the facts and circumstances of the above case and we are competent to swear to this affidavit.

2. The Deponent Nos. 01 and 02 have filed the above case, for quashing of the FIR in Cr. No. 14/2025 registered by the South East Women Police Station, Bengaluru City on 13.03.2025 on the basis of complaint lodged by the Respondent No. 02 herein for the offences punishable under Sections 85 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Samhitha and Sections 03, 04 of the DP Act as against the Petitioners.

3. The Deponents have now resolved their differences amicably with respect to the instant Petition and that Respondent No. 02 has compromised the instant matter in terms of the Mediation Settlement Agreement dated 17.12.2025 arrived at in MC No. 1372/2025 on the file of the Hon'ble VI Additional Family judge, at Bengaluru. The Respondent No. 02 also state that the said decision has been taken without any threat or coercion or undue influence and has stated that the matter has been settled out of her own free will.

4. The Deponents No. 01 and 02 have reached a settlement with Deponent No. 03. Deponent No. 03



gives her unequivocal and free consent that she no longer wishes to pursue the said case in Cr. No. 14/2025 registered by the South East Women Police Station, Bengaluru City on 13.03.2025, and that she has no objection to the quashing of the said case, and the proceedings emanating therefrom.

5. The Respondent No. 02 has further agreed to withdraw all proceedings arising out of the said matrimonial dispute, including any proceedings initiated by her for recovery of maintenance, and has also agreed before the competent Court for dissolution of the marriage.

6. In view of the amicable resolution of disputes between the Deponents, it is humbly prayed that this is a fit and proper case for this Hon'ble Court to exercise its inherent power to quash and set aside the case and the proceedings emanating therefrom."

5. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the case of ***Jitendra Raghuvanshi and others v. Babita Raghuvanshi and another*** reported in **2013(2) Crimes 90(SC)**, has held that 'the inherent powers of the High Court under Section 482 of Cr.P.C., are wide and unfettered. It is the duty of the Courts to encourage



genuine settlements of matrimonial disputes, particularly, when the same are on considerable increase. Even if the offences are non-compoundable, if they relate to matrimonial disputes and the Court is satisfied that, the parties have settled the same amicably and without any pressure, for the purpose of securing the ends of justice, Section 320 of the Code, would not be a bar to the exercise of power of quashing of FIR.

6. The matter arises out of a matrimonial dispute, wherein, the parties have amicably settled their disputes, in terms of the settlement/agreement entered before the Family Court, Bengaluru in M.C.No.1372/2025.

7. Respondent No.2, present before the Court submits that in view of the settlement, she is not interested in pursuing the matter any further and she has no objection to quash the proceedings.



8. In light of the above, no purpose will be served in continuing the proceedings initiated against the petitioners. To meet the ends of justice, it is just and proper to quash the proceedings. Accordingly, the following:

ORDER

- (i) Petitions are ***allowed***;
- (ii) The FIR in Crime No.14/2025 pending on the file of South East Women Police Station, Bengaluru City and also consequential proceedings arising therein pending on the file of XXIX A.C.J.M, Bengaluru, are ***quashed***.

**Sd/-
(MOHAMMAD NAWAZ)
JUDGE**