



\$~80

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 80/2025 & CRL. M.A. 717/2025**
RAHUL KUMAR & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Karandeep Singh, Advocate for
P-1 to P-4.
Mr. Sachendra Kumar and Mr. Anil
Kumar, Advocates for P-5.

versus

THE STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, SC (Crl.) with Mr.
Abhinav Kumar and Mr. Aryan
Sachdeva, Advocates for State.
SI Pankaj Kumar, P.S. Jyoti Nagar.
Mr. Vishal Chaudhary, Mr. Sumit
Saxena, Ms. Priyanka Vishwakarma,
Advocates for R-2 with R-2 (through
VC).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
17.04.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 409/2018 dated 14th November, 2018, registered at Police Station Jyoti Nagar for the offences under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860,¹ and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 as well as all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom. This request is made in light of the amicable settlement arrived at by the parties, as evidenced by the



Agreement of Settlement dated 30th May 2022 executed between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No.2/ Complainant before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi. A copy of the aforementioned Settlement Agreement has been duly placed on record.

2. The marriage between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 was solemnised on 10th December, 2016, however the parties eventually separated on account of temperamental differences. Their marriage has now been dissolved through decree of divorce by mutual consent dated 16th March, 2023 issued by the Family Court, Shahdara District, Karkardooma Courts, Delhi.

3. In terms of the Agreement for Settlement, Petitioner No. 1 had agreed to pay a total sum of INR 9,00,000/- to Respondent No. 2. Of the said amount, a sum of INR 3,50,000/- was agreed to be paid to Respondent No. 2 at the time of recording of first motion for seeking divorce under Section 13-B(1) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. A further sum of INR 3,50,000/- was to be paid to her at the time of recording of statement of second motion. The remaining amount of INR 2,00,000/- was to be paid to Respondent No. 2 at the time of quashing of the impugned FIR. Counsel for the Petitioners states that the entire settlement amount has been paid to Respondent No. 2 and that she has no objections to the quashing of the impugned FIR.

4. Respondent No. 2 is present through video conferencing, duly identified by the IO as well as the counsel. She states that she has no objections to the quashing of the FIR. An affidavit cum No Objection Certificate to this effect has also been placed on record.

5. Before the Joint Registrar, on 19th February, 2025, counsel for the

¹ “IPC”



Petitioner handed over a demand draft bearing DD No. 303213, for the sum of INR 2,00,000/- drawn on PNB Bank dated 22nd January, 2025, to Respondent No. 2. Thereafter, the statement of Respondent No. 2 was recorded on the same day, wherein she affirmed receipt of the entire settlement amount towards settlement of alimony, maintenance, *stridhan* and other articles. On 25th March, 2025, Respondent No. 2 appeared before the Joint Registrar's Court through video conferencing, and submitted that the DD had been duly realised, and that she had no objections to the quashing of the impugned FIR.

6. At this juncture, it is imperative to emphasise the Court's power under Section 482 of the CrPC to quash criminal proceedings pursuant to a settlement between the parties. In this regard, the Supreme Court in ***Narinder Singh & Ors. v. State of Punjab & Anr.***,² has laid down certain guidelines and parameters for the High Courts while accepting settlement and quashing the proceedings:

"29. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we sum up and lay down the following principles by which the High Court would be guided in giving adequate treatment to the settlement between the parties and exercising its power under Section 482 of the Code while accepting the settlement and quashing the proceedings or refusing to accept the settlement with direction to continue with the criminal proceedings:

29.1. Power conferred under Section 482 of the Code is to be distinguished from the power which lies in the Court to compound the offences under Section 320 of the Code. No doubt, under Section 482 of the Code, the High Court has inherent power to quash the criminal proceedings even in those cases which are not compoundable, where the parties have settled the matter between themselves. However, this power is to be exercised sparingly and with caution.

29.2. When the parties have reached the settlement and on that basis petition for quashing the criminal proceedings is filed, the guiding factor in such cases would be to secure:

² (2014) 6 SCC 466.



(i) ends of justice, or

(ii) to prevent abuse of the process of any court.

While exercising the power the High Court is to form an opinion on either of the aforesaid two objectives.

29.3. Such a power is not to be exercised in those prosecutions which involve heinous and serious offences of mental depravity or offences like murder, rape, dacoity, etc. Such offences are not private in nature and have a serious impact on society. Similarly, for the offences alleged to have been committed under special statute like the Prevention of Corruption Act or the offences committed by public servants while working in that capacity are not to be quashed merely on the basis of compromise between the victim and the offender.

29.4. On the other hand, those criminal cases having overwhelmingly and predominantly civil character, particularly those arising out of commercial transactions or arising out of matrimonial relationship or family disputes should be quashed when the parties have resolved their entire disputes among themselves.

29.5. While exercising its powers, the High Court is to examine as to whether the possibility of conviction is remote and bleak and continuation of criminal cases would put the accused to great oppression and prejudice and extreme injustice would be caused to him by not quashing the criminal cases."

[Emphasis Supplied]

7. In view of the law discussed above as well as the settlement between the parties, the Court is of the considered opinion that this matter deserves to be given a quietus, as the continuation of the present proceedings would serve no fruitful purpose, but rather only amount to an abuse of the judicial process and impose an unwarranted burden on the State Exchequer.

8. Accordingly, the petition is allowed, and FIR No. 409/2018, registered at Police Station Jyoti Nagar under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC and Sections 3/4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, and the proceedings emanating therefrom are quashed.

9. The parties shall abide by the terms of settlement.

10. Accordingly, the petition is disposed of. Pending applications (if any)



are disposed of as infructuous.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

APRIL 17, 2025

as