



\$~49

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

+ CRL.M.C. 2137/2025 & CRL.M.A. 9579/2025

CHET RAM @ MONU & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. F.K. Jha and Mr. Gaurav Jha,
Advocates along with petitioners in
person.

versus

GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI AND ANR

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for the
State with ASI Om Prakash, P.S. Sarai
Rohilla.
Mr. Vijay Shankar Rai, Advocate for
R-2.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

30.05.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition filed under Section 528 of the BNSS seeks quashing of FIR No. 166/2019, under Sections 323/325/354/354A/354D/451/506/509/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Sarai Rohilla, Delhi and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Manya, learned Judicial Magistrate, Mahila Court-02, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the present FIR was registered as a result of matrimonial discord between the brother of complainant (Rahul) and brother-in-law/Sadhoo of Rahul and his younger



brother, *i.e.*, petitioners. It is further submitted that during the pendency of the proceedings, the parties have settled their dispute *vide* agreement dated 22.03.2025 and in pursuance of the said settlement, respondent no. 2/complainant in the present FIR has no objection if the present FIR along with the pending chargesheet is quashed.

4. Petitioners and complainant/respondent no. 2 are present before the Court and have been duly identified by their respective counsels, as well as the Investigating Officer, ASI Om Prakash, P.S. Sarai Rohilla.

5. The complainant/respondent No.2 states that the matter has been settled with the petitioners and she has no objection if the FIR is quashed.

6. In *Gian Singh v. State of Punjab*, (2012) 10 SCC 303, the Hon'ble Supreme Court has recognized the need of amicable resolution of disputes by observing as under:-

“61. ... In other words, the High Court must consider whether it would be unfair or contrary to the interest of justice to continue with the criminal proceedings or continuation of criminal proceedings would tantamount to abuse of process of law despite settlement and compromise between the victim and the wrongdoer and whether to secure the ends of justice, it is appropriate that criminal case is put to an end and if the answer to the above question(s) is in the affirmative, the High Court shall be well within its jurisdiction to quash the criminal proceeding.”

7. In view of the aforesaid circumstances, and the fact that the parties have put a quietus to the dispute, no useful purpose will be served in continuing with the present FIR No. 166/2019, under Sections 323/325/354/354A/354D/451/506/509/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Sarai Rohilla, Delhi and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Manya, learned



Judicial Magistrate, Mahila Court-02, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi.

8. In the interest of justice, the petition is allowed, and the FIR No. 166/2019, under Sections 323/325/354/354A/354D/451/506/509/34 of the IPC, registered at P.S. Sarai Rohilla, Delhi and all other consequential proceedings emanating therefrom, including the chargesheet pending before the Court of Ms. Manya, learned Judicial Magistrate, Mahila Court-02, Central District, Tis Hazari Courts, Delhi, is hereby quashed.

9. Petition is allowed and disposed of accordingly.

10. Pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

MAY 30, 2025/kr/bsr

[Click here to check corrigendum, if any](#)