



\$~84

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

+ **CRL.M.C. 2820/2025**

NARESH DUTT SHARMA & ANR.

.....Petitioners

Through: Mr. Mukesh Kumar Solanki,
Advocate.

versus

THE STATE & ANR.

.....Respondents

Through: Mr. Nawal Kishore Jha, APP for State
with SI Manoj Kumari and W/SI
Priyanka, PS Janakpuri.

CORAM:

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE GIRISH KATHPALIA

ORDER

21.05.2025

%

[Physical Hearing/Hybrid Hearing (as per request)]

1. Petitioners seek quashing of FIR No. 254/2022 of PS Janakpuri for offence under Section 498A/406/354/506/509/323/376/109/34 IPC. The petition was filed on the ground that the complainant *de facto* has compromised the disputes with the petitioners. Both petitioners as well as respondent no.2 have personally appeared and are identified by their respective counsel and Investigating Officer/SI Manoj Kumari.
2. Petitioner no.1 is father-in-law of respondent no.2 while petitioner no.2 is sister-in-law (sister of husband of respondent no.2). Husband of respondent no.2 also has appeared but is not a party to these proceedings.
3. I have heard all parties at length.
4. The impugned FIR contains extremely serious and obnoxious allegations that petitioner no.1 not just raped respondent no.2, but he even

This is a digitally signed order.

The authenticity of the order can be re-verified from Delhi High Court Order Portal by scanning the QR code shown above.

The Order is downloaded from the DHC Server on 22/05/2025 at 12:12:57



inserted a stick in her vagina.

5. If the allegations levelled in the FIR are truthful, obviously the petitioners must be punished in accordance with law. But if those allegations are false, State has to act against respondent no.2. For, such false complaints have wide ranging consequences across the society. If the allegations are false, it not only degrades the sanctity of relationship between a father-in-law and a daughter-in-law, it also leads to a cynicism across the society which starts suspecting even the genuine victims.

6. Considering the above circumstances, learned counsel for petitioners on instructions of his clients present in the courtroom seeks permission to withdraw this petition with liberty to pursue the remaining litigations involving property disputes between the petitioners and respondent no.2 and her husband, including the eviction proceedings under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007.

7. As requested, the petition is dismissed as withdrawn with liberty as sought. No costs are being imposed since truthfulness or falsity of the allegations levelled by respondent no.2 is yet to be tested through trial.

GIRISH KATHPALIA, J

MAY 21, 2025/DR

Click here to check corrigendum, if any