



\$~65

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 1506/2025, CRL.M.A. 6820-6821/2025**

NAVEEN KUMAR AND ORS

.....Petitioners

Through: Ms. Sarthak Gupta, Advocate.

Versus

STATE GNCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Satinder Singh Bawa, APP for
State with Mr. Ghanshyam, SI, PS-
EOW.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

20.03.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 0016/2017 dated 13th February, 2017, registered at Police Station Crime (Women) Cell Nanakpura for offences under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860¹. This request is made in light of the amicable settlement reached between the parties, as evidenced by the Agreement of Settlement executed on 21st April, 2023 between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No.2/ Complainant before the Delhi Mediation Centre, Patiala House Court. 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 February, 2015, and one male child, namely, Atharv

¹ "IPC"



Singh, was born from this marriage on 8th December, 2015. However, the parties eventually separated on account of temperamental differences. The marriage has now been dissolved through decree of divorce by mutual consent dated 11th September, 2024 issued by the Family Court-01, South-West, Dwarka, New Delhi.

3. In terms of the Agreement for Settlement, Petitioner No. 1 had agreed to pay a total sum of INR 18,00,000/- to Respondent No. 2. Of the said amount, the first instalment amounting to INR 50,000/- was paid to Respondent No. 2 before the filing of first motion petition under Section 13B(1) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955.² The second instalment amounting to INR 4,50,000/- was paid to her at the time of recording of first motion for seeking divorce under Section 13-B(1) HMA; and the third instalment of INR 2,50,000/- along with an FD of INR 4,00,000/- was paid to her at the time of recording of statement of second motion. The remaining amount of INR 2,50,000/- along with an FD of INR 4,00,000/- was agreed to be paid to Respondent No. 2 at the time of quashing of the impugned FIR. In this regard, the Petitioners have placed on record a copy of the demand draft bearing DD No. 493681, for the sum of INR 2,50,000/- drawn on SBI Bank dated 18th February, 2025.

4. Respondent No. 2 is present through video conferencing, and has been duly identified by the IO. 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 3rd March, 2025, Petitioner No. 1 gave the demand draft to Respondent No. 2. Thereafter, the statement of



Respondent No. 2 was recorded, wherein she submitted that the DD had been duly realised, and that she had no objections to the quashing of the impugned FIR. On 6th March, 2025, Respondent No. 2 appeared before the Joint Registrar's Court and affirmed receipt of the entire settlement amount towards her articles as well as stridhan. The Joint Registrar's Court also clarified that per the settlement, the custody of minor child, namely, Atharv Singh shall remain with Respondent No. 2 without any visitation rights to Petitioner No. 1 or his family members or relatives, and that the settlement between the parties is without prejudice to the rights of the minor child.

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.***,³ 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.*

² “HMA”

³ (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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:

(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. 0016/2017 dated 13th February, 2017 under Sections 498A/406/34 IPC registered at P.S. Crime (Women) Cell Nanakpura, Delhi 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

MARCH 20, 2025

nk