



\$~32

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 3922/2023**

MANISH VERMA

.....Petitioner

Through: Mr. Rishi Manchanda with Mr. Arun Kumar, Mr. Siddharth Mullick and Mr. Lakhan Gupta, Advs.

versus

STATE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjeev Sabharwal, APP for the State with SI Sangeeta, Delhi Police Academy and SI Mahesh from P.S. Dwarka North.
Mr. Daveinder Hora, Mr. Amandeep Singh and Ms Monika, Advs. for respondent no. 2 with respondent no. 2 in person

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

08.10.2025

%

1. Petitioner and complainant/respondent no. 2 are husband and wife and they seek compromise quashing of an FIR No. 608/2021 dated 09.08.2021 registered at Police Station - Dwarka North under Section 354/354A IPC read with Section 10 of the POCSO Act along with all the proceedings arising therefrom on the basis of a compromise between the parties. The



complainant/wife of the petitioner lodged the FIR qua the victim who is none other than daughter of the parties.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that FIR was result of gross misunderstanding between the parties. They have now amicably settled the dispute, and are living happily together after resuming matrimonial ties.

2.1 Learned counsel submits that the dispute has no overriding public interest involved, and continuation of proceedings serves no fruitful purpose, except causing mental trauma and harassment to both parties. Moreover, he submits that the pendency of the proceedings is adversely affecting the matrimonial life of the petitioner with whom complainant is now residing along with their minor daughter.

3. Learned counsel for respondent no.2 and learned APP for the State concur with the factum of the compromise between the parties. Learned counsel for Respondent no. 2 conveys his no objection to the quashing of the FIR.

4. 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.

5. The complainant/mother is present in person. On a query put to her, she submits that she did not realise the repercussions of the allegations levelled against her husband at the relevant time nor was she aware what sections will be invoked by the investigating agency. She submits that having done that, she subsequently realised that what was a family matter took an ugly turn resulting in unnecessary criminal proceedings. She submits that the family feud has been amicably settled. Pursuant thereto; the complainant and the petitioner's father with their minor child have resumed



matrimonial ties and are living happily together.

6. Upon hearing the parties and examining the nature of the dispute, it is borne out that the FIR was lodged out of a misunderstanding. Even on a plain reading, and in light of the candid statements of parties, it appears doubtful whether the essential ingredients of the offences invoked under the penal provisions are satisfied. In light thereof, I am of the view that the petition deserves to be allowed on that count as well.

7. Be that as it may, considering that the parties are residing together harmoniously and leading a happy, peaceful, and tranquil family life, it would be travesty of justice to put the parties to undergo the harassment and humiliation of the trial, which in any case in all likelihood would result in the acquittal of the petitioner since respondent no.2, being his wife, does not wish to press any charges.

8. Quashing the proceedings would, on the contrary, safeguard the sanctity of their marital life, prevent unwarranted hardship, and uphold their right to live together in peace and dignity, free from stigma.

9. On the other hand, continuing with criminal proceedings would not only be a drain on judicial resources and abuse of the process of law, but may result in hostility between the parties and defeat the very purpose of the settlement.

10. In the premise, the ends of justice thus warrant quashing of the proceedings under Section 528 BNSS, thereby enabling the couple to lead a peaceful and dignified life. Reference may also be made to the judgment of the Supreme Court in **Gian Singh v. State of Punjab & Anr. (2012) 10 SCC 303**.

11. Consequently, the instant petition is allowed. The criminal



proceedings arising out of FIR No. 608/2021 dated 09.08.2021 registered at Police Station - Dwarka North under Section 354/354A IPC read with Section 10 of the POCSO Act along with all consequential proceedings arising therefrom, are hereby quashed.

12. The petition, along with pending applications, if any, stands disposed of.

ARUN MONGA, J

OCTOBER 8, 2025

acm