



\$~56

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **W.P.(CRL) 887/2025 & CRL.M.A. 8335/2025**

ANIMESH KUMAR AND OTHERSPetitioners
Through: Mr. Fatesh Kumar Sanu,
Mr. J.M. Junaid, Mr.
Abhishek Saxena, Mr.
Vaibhav Patel, Ms.
Kamini & Mr. Neeraj
Kumar Gupta, Advs.

versus

STATE OF NCT DELHI AND ANOTHER
.....Respondents
Through: Mr. Rahul Tyagi, ASC
(Crl.) for the State along
with Mr. Mathew M..
Philip, Mr. Sangeet Sibou
& Mr. Aniket Kumar
Singh, Advs.
SI Sheetal, PS Hauz Khas.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT MAHAJAN

ORDER
19.03.2025

%

CRL.M.A. 8336/2025 (exemption)

1. Exemption allowed, subject to all just exceptions.
2. The application stands disposed of.

W.P.(CRL) 887/2025 & CRL.M.A. 8335/2025

3. The petitioners seek quashing of the FIR No.557/2024 dated 19.12.2024, registered at Police Station Hauz Khas under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners have been unnecessarily dragged in the present case. He submits that the marriage of the Petitioner No. 1 was solemnized with the complainant way back on 27.04.2022. He



submits that no cruelty or demand of dowry was ever meted out on the complainant or her family members.

5. It is observed that the FIR was registered recently on 19.12.2024 and the investigation is at a nascent stage. From the perusal of contents of the FIR, it cannot be said that allegation in regard to commission of cognizable offence has not been made.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners seeks to rely on various documents in support of his contention.

7. The same is in the nature of defence would at first instance will be looked into by the police during the course of the investigation, whereafter appropriate report will be filed.

8. The Court exercising power under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, is not required to consider disputed questions of facts which can only be considered after the detailed investigation has been carried out. The investigation cannot be nipped in the bud only because the petitioners apprehend harassment.

9. In view of the above, this Court does not consider it apposite to entertain the present petition at this stage.

10. The petition is, therefore, dismissed.

11. Needless to say, the petitioners are at liberty to seek appropriate remedy in case of any grievance in future.

12. Pending application also stands disposed of.

AMIT MAHAJAN, J

MARCH 19, 2025

“SK”