



\$~56

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

+ CRL.M.C. 1347/2025

HEM CHAND & ORS.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr.Prakash Khandelwal, Advocate

versus

STATE GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI

.....Respondent

Through: Mr.Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State alongwith W/SI Priyanka and SI
Satish Kumar, P.S.-Bara Hindu Rao,
Delhi and complainant in-person

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

06.08.2025

%

1. Petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No. 85/2018 dated 22.06.2018 under Sections 323, 342, 354A, 354B, 506 and 34 IPC, registered at P.S. Bara Hindu Rao, Delhi, along with all the proceedings arising therefrom, on the basis of the compromise arrived at between the parties.

2. Brief facts of the case are that the daughter of the Respondent No.2 got married to Sachin Kumar (Son of Petitioner no.1) on 21.02.2007.

2.1 On 13.10.2017, some misunderstanding arose between the petitioner no.3 and Mrs. Kamini (daughter of the Respondent No.2), who are sisters in laws of each other, wherein the petitioner No.1, her Father-in-law and his mother i.e. petitioner No.4 also intervened.

2.2 Subsequently, on the basis of the complaint by Respondent no.2, the



aforesaid FIR was registered against all the petitioners i.e. Petitioner No.1(Father-in-law), Petitioner No.4 (Grandmother-in-law), Petitioner No.2 (Brother-in-law) and Petitioner No.3 (Sister-in-law) of the daughter of Respondent no.2

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners and Respondent no.2, with the intervention of well-wishers and family members, of their own volition and without any coercion or undue influence, have now amicably settled their differences *vide* Settlement Deed which is placed on record. He further submits that in view of the compromise between the parties, Respondent No.2 is not inclined to press charges against the petitioners and proceed further in the matter.

4. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard the rival contentions and also interacted with the victim who is present in Court. It is stated that she is 42 years old and fully conscious of her rights and capable of taking decisions for her welfare. On a specific query put to her *qua* the nature of the allegations and the alleged offences involved in the FIR, she categorically submits that she regrets having made such allegations against the family members including her father-in-law, as she did not quite appreciate the adverse consequences of including such Sections at the time of registration of the FIR.

4.1 She submits that otherwise, the same arose out of the matrimonial acrimony at the relevant time between her and her husband which has now been amicably taken care of with the indulgence of the elders and the family members.

4.2 She further states that she does not wish to press any charges in view of the settlement arrived between her and her husband and is currently



enjoying the matrimonial bliss and therefore, wishes to maintain cordial relationships not only with her husband but also with the other petitioners who are her parents-in-law.

5. In response to a Court query, both the counsel for Respondent No. 2 and the learned Public Prosecutor for the State concur with the factum of the compromise arrived at between the parties and convey their no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

6. In the aforesaid backdrop, I have heard learned counsel for the Petitioners and Respondent No.2 as well as perused the material available on record.

7. Having interacted with the complainant and given that it seems to be an entirely family matter and purely private in nature, not involving either public interest or any societal interest, it would be an exercise in futility to continue with the further criminal proceedings as the same would be nothing but an abuse of the process of law, apart from being a burden on the judicial system as well as wasteful expenditure of the public by the prosecution.

8. The genuineness of compromise is not in dispute. However, since the trial Court was not empowered to compound certain offences, the criminal proceedings could not be dropped. In the premise, in the larger interest of justice, invoking inherent powers vested with this Court under Section 528 BNSS it is deemed expedient to quash the FIR in question. Reference in this context may be had to judgment rendered in the case of ***Gian Singh Vs. State of Punjab & Anr. [(2012) 10 SCC 303]***.

9. Taking a wholesome view and in order to let the parties to enter mutual cordiality and the family bonhomie which will go long way to establish peace rather than promote hostility in case further proceedings



continue, this is a fit case to exercise inherent power under 528 of BNSS in quashing the FIR in question.

10. Accordingly, the petition is allowed and the FIR No. 85/2018 dated 22.06.2018 under Sections 323, 342, 354A, 354B, 506 and 34 IPC, registered at P.S. Bara Hindu Rao, Delhi, along with all consequential proceedings arising there from are hereby quashed.

11. The petition stands disposed of.

12. All pending application(s), if any, shall also stand disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

AUGUST 6, 2025

dy