



\$~64

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 2613/2025, CRL.M.A. 11735/2025**

CHANDRA SHEKHAR BANSAL & ORS.Petitioners
Through: Mr. Ranbir Singh, Advocate with
petitioners.

versus

STATE (GOVT. OF NCT OF DELHI) & ANR.Respondents
Through: Mr. Digam Singh Dagar, APP for
State with SI Akash Kumar with SI
Vivek Dhama, P.S. Bhajanpura.
Mr. Anil K. Chauhan & Mr. Shailja
Chauhan, Advs. for R-2.
Complainant/R-2 in person.

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ARUN MONGA

ORDER

% **30.07.2025**

1. The petitioners herein seek quashing of an FIR No. 448/2024 dated 07.07.2024, under Sections 3(5), 115(2), 333, 351(2) of BNS and Section 27 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at P.S. Bhajan Pura, Delhi and the proceedings emanating therefrom.

2. Dispute between the private parties arose from matrimonial discord between Nikhil Bansal (husband) who is the son of petitioner no.1 and Aakansha (wife) who is the niece of respondent no.2. The couple got married on 11.06.2023 according to Hindu rites. Due to differences, the niece of respondent no.2 started living with her parents separately.

2.1 Per the FIR, Chandrashekhar/ petitioner no.1 is the father-in-law of the respondent no. 2/complainant's niece, Akshay Bansal/ petitioner no.2 is his son, Ashok Bansal/ petitioner no.3 and Rajneesh Bansal/ petitioner no.4



are brothers of petitioner no.1. It was alleged that all the petitioners, came to the complainant's house and began abusing and assaulting him. Thereafter, the petitioners stood on the road near the complainant's house and created a ruckus.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the parties have now amicably settled the dispute arising out of matrimonial discord *vide* two MOUs. The first MOU dated 17.03.2025 was executed between the son of petitioner no.1, i.e. the husband and the niece of respondent no.2, i.e. wife. The second MOU dated 28.03.2025 was executed between the petitioners and respondent no.2. Both the MOUs were duly signed by the parties.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners would further submit that as per the terms settlement, the son of petitioner no.1 and niece of respondent no.2 have already signed the petition under Section 13(B)(1) of Hindu Marriage Act for dissolving the marriage between them by mutual consent. The same is under process for filing.

5. It has been mutually decided by the parties that the son of petitioner no.1 shall pay Rs.32,00,000/- to the niece of respondent no.2 in two instalments and steps will be taken to get the FIR in question quashed along with quashing of any other FIR filed by the niece of respondent no.2.

6. Parties are present in person in the Court and I have interacted with them. On a query to the complainant, he candidly submits that he has entered into compromise on his own volition without any duress or coercion and does not wish to press any charges against the petitioners in view of settlement arrived between them.

7. The petitioners have shown remorse for their conduct and they undertake not to repeat the same in future.



8. In view of the above, further proceedings in the present matter would be an abuse of process of law, especially where the parties have amicably settled their dispute, which does not harm any public interest or interest of the society at large. In such circumstances, continuation of proceedings may result in hostility between the parties and defeat the very purpose of settlement.

9. On the other hand, quashing would result in maintaining the much desired cordiality between the petitioners and complainant, who are well acquainted and known to each other from past and thus, establish bonhomie amongst them to be enjoyed in posterity.

10. In light of the above, no useful purpose would be served to continue with the criminal proceedings as it would be an exercise in futility. In any case, chances of conviction are almost negligible in view of respondent no.2/complainant having decided not to press any charges against the petitioners.

11. Moreover, allowing the criminal proceedings to continue would unnecessarily burden the administrative and judicial system and waste the valuable time of the investigating agencies and the Court. Prolonging the proceedings would only perpetuate animosity between the parties. In this context, reference may be had to judgment rendered in ***Gian Singh vs. State of Punjab & Anr., (2012) 10 SCC 303.***

12. On a court query, qua the veracity of the compromise between the parties, the learned APP for the State also does not dispute it.

13. Consequently the FIR No. 448/2024 dated 07.07.2024, under Sections 3(5), 115(2), 333, 351(2) of BNS and Section 27 of Arms Act, 1959 registered at P.S. Bhajan Pura, Delhi and further proceedings arising there-



from are hereby quashed.

14. Petition is allowed as above. The parties shall remain bound by the statements made in Court today.

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

ARUN MONGA, J

JULY 30, 2025/akc