



\$~22

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

% **Date of Decision: 6<sup>th</sup> August, 2026**

# **CNR No. DLHC010095862026**

+ **CRL.M.C. 1934/2026**

**NEETU**

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rajesh Harnal with Ms. Swati  
Aggarwal, Advocates with petitioner.

versus

**STATE OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.**

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sunil Kumar Gautam, APP for the  
State with SI Sweta, PS S. Mandi.  
Mr. B. Badrinath with Mr. Dhruv  
Bhardwaj, Advocates for respondent  
Nos.2 and 3 with respondent Nos.2  
and 3 in person.

**CORAM:**

**HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE MANOJ JAIN**

**J U D G M E N T (oral)**

1. Petitioner seeks quashing of FIR No.120/2017 dated 20/05/2017, registered at P.S. Subzi Mandi for commission of offences under Sections 376/354(A)/354/354(B)/506 IPC and Section 6 of the *Protection of Children from Sexual Offence Act (POCSO), 2012* along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of settlement arrived at between the parties.
2. Respondent Nos.2 and 3 are real sisters.
3. Unfortunately, they had been wronged and sexually assaulted by their father, which resulted in registration of abovesaid FIR. They had also made certain allegations against their step mother (petitioner herein).
4. Charge-sheet was filed against their father as well as their step-mother.
5. Charges were framed on 13.03.2018. There was alteration/amendment



in charge on 24.03.2021.

6. Fact, however, remains that the present petition, which seeks quashing on the basis of settlement, primarily, emanates from the fact that, in the interregnum, father of respondent Nos.2 and 3 has expired. Copy of his Death Certificate has been placed on record which indicates his date of death as 12.05.2023. Factum of his death has been duly verified already as the proceedings *qua* him have abated.

7. The father of respondent Nos.2 and 3 was responsible for aggravated penetrative sexual assault. The allegations and averments *qua* step mother are somewhat different as according to victims, one male friend of their step mother used to come to their house and on the basis of instigation of their step-mother, such male friend touched them inappropriately and intimidated them.

8. It is admitted case of prosecution that there is no clue with respect to such male friend of the petitioner and, therefore, neither he could be arrested nor there is any charge-sheet *qua* him.

9. Both the sisters i.e. respondent Nos.2 and 3 are present in Court with their counsel. The Investigating Officer is also present. Respondent Nos.2 and 3 have been identified by their counsel as well as the Investigating Officer.

10. Keeping in mind, the sensitivity of the matter, the Court chose it appropriate to interact with them in the chamber.

11. Both the sisters have, in no uncertain terms, submitted that they have entered into settlement voluntarily and there is no threat, force or coercion from any angle whatsoever.

12. The elder sister submits that she got married in the year 2017. She is



having a degree of *Master in Computer Application* (MCA) and is, presently, a freelance IT professional.

13. Her younger sister is a private tutor.

14. It is apprised by them that there were other connected matters which have either been withdrawn or got quashed. They reiterate the terms of settlement, as mentioned in *Memorandum of Settlement* (MoU) dated 11.08.2025. They submit that it has been duly signed by them. Such MoU also talks about division of their properties. They submit that they have entered into settlement to put an end to the on-going conflicts and to bring about cordial relation and to preserve peace and harmony within the family and to also preserve the reputation of the family. They submit that they have decided to bury the acrimony and to move on. They submit that they want to put an end to the emotional stress, emanating from the abovesaid criminal case and would have no objection if the FIR is quashed, supplementing that they have no surviving grudge or surviving grievance against their stepmother.

15. Learned counsel for the complainant also submits that the quashing is as per the sentiments expressed by both the sisters. He also submits that their grandmother, who is, unfortunately, no longer alive, also wanted the criminal case to be over so that the reputation of the family does not get hit.

16. As already noticed above, the offences against the present petitioner are of abetment as she had, allegedly, instigated her one unknown male friend, who, based on such instigation, touched the victims inappropriately.

17. The Court also had an interaction with the petitioner and she also assures complete compliance of the terms of settlement, as mentioned in MoU dated 11.08.2025



18. It will be useful to make reference to *Madhukar & Anr. vs. State of Maharashtra*: 2025 SCC OnLine SC 1415. The abovesaid case also related to offence of sexual assault i.e. offence under Section 376 IPC and, when an application was moved by the parties seeking quashing of the proceedings on the basis of settlement, such petition was dismissed by the jurisdictional High Court which compelled the parties to approach Hon'ble Supreme Court. The Apex Court observed as under in para 6:-

*“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.”*

*(emphasis supplied)*

19. In *Mohammad Parweej vs. State (NCT of Delhi)* 2026: DHC:1776, this Court, while quashing a case of sexual assault, observed that though quashing cannot be sought on mere settlement but at the same time, the justice delivery system cannot turn blind eye to the ground realities and has to respond appropriately after careful consideration of all the attendant circumstances.

20. In *Narinder Singh & Ors. vs. State of Punjab & Anr.*: (2014) 6 SCC 466, Hon'ble Apex Court has 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, and that the scope of conviction was remote and bleak. Reference be also made to *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr.*: (2012) 10 SCC 303.

21. Herein, the situation is no different. Both the victims are now left with



no grievance against their step mother. The other cases have also been quashed or withdrawn in terms of settlement. In view of the settlement arrived at between the parties, continuing with criminal proceedings would serve no useful purpose as the chances of conviction are also bleak as complainants do not wish to press any charges against the petitioners.

22. Accordingly, exercising inherent powers vested in this Court under Section 528 of *Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023*, it is deemed appropriate to quash the instant FIR.

23. Consequently, to secure the ends of justice, FIR No.120/2017 dated 20/05/2017, registered at P.S. Subzi Mandi for commission of offences under Sections 376/354(A)/354/354(B)/506 IPC and Section 6 of the *Protection of Children from Sexual Offence Act (POCSO), 2012*, along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, is, hereby, quashed. Original affidavits of the parties be submitted to the learned Trial Court within the period of four weeks, so that these become part of the Trial Court Record.

24. The petition stands disposed of in aforesaid terms.

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

**AUGUST 06, 2026**  
**st/sa**