



\$~71

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

+ W.P.(CRL) 1234/2025

BALAKRISHNAN SUBRAMANI & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Hitesh Yadav, Advocate

versus

THE STATE NCT OF DELHI THROUGH ITS SHO PS BINDAPUR
& ANR.Respondents

Through: Mr. Sanjay Lao, Standing Counsel
with Mr. Abhinav Kr. Arya, Mr.
Aryan Sachdeva, Advocates along
with SI Sahil Gahlawat, PS Bindapur,
Dwarka
Mr. Girish Kumar, Advocate for R-2
Complainant in person (through VC)

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER
15.05.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed seeking quashing of FIR No. 681/2023 dated 11th October, 2023, registered at Police Station Bindapur for offences under Sections 498A/406/34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860,¹ as well as all consequential proceedings emanating therefrom. This request is made in light of the amicable settlement reached between the parties, as evidenced by the Settlement Deed executed between Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No.2/ Complainant on 25th June, 2024, before the Mediation

¹ "IPC"



Centre, Dwarka Courts, New Delhi. 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 22nd November, 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 03rd August, 2024 issued by the Family Court, South West, Dwarka, New Delhi.

3. The Petitioners have stated that Petitioner No. 1 had agreed to pay a total sum of INR 30,00,000/- to Respondent No. 2. Of the said amount, a sum of INR 10,00,000/- has been paid to Respondent No. 2 at the time of recording of first motion for seeking divorce under Section 13-B(1) of the Hindu Marriage Act, 1955. A further sum of INR 10,00,000/- has been paid to her at the time of recording of statement of second motion. The remaining amount of INR 10,00,000/- was agreed to be paid to Respondent No. 2 at the time of quashing of the impugned FIR.

4. Respondent No. 2 is present through video conferencing, duly identified by the IO as well as the counsel. 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. The statement of Respondent No. 2 was record before the Joint Registrar on 21st April, 2025, wherein she affirmed receipt of the entire settlement amount of INR 30,00,000/- towards her *stridhan* and other articles. On the same day, Respondent No. 2 appeared before the Joint Registrar's Court in person, and submitted that she had no objections to the quashing of the impugned FIR.

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.***,² 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.

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

² (2014) 6 SCC 466.



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. 681/2023 dated 11th October, 2023, registered at Police Station Bindapur for offences under Sections 498A/406/34 of the IPC, as well as all consequential 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

MAY 15, 2025/ab