



\$~50

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CRL.M.C. 3723/2025 & CRL.M.A. 16359/2025**
SHIKHAR GOEL & ORS.Petitioners

Through: Mr. Shivam Gaur, Advocate with
Petitioners (in-Persons).

versus

STATE (NCT OF DELHI) & ANRRespondents

Through: Mr. Hemant Mehla, APP with Ms.
Minakshi Rana, Mr. Mohit Rana, Ms.
Akansha Tagra, Mr. Aakash Gehlot,
Mr. Siddharth Bharadwaj, Ms. Neha
Aggarwal, Mr. Praveen Kumar, Mr.
Puneet Khanna, Mr. Amit Saini, Mr.
Gourav Bharti, Mr. Arvind Kumar
Chandra and Mr. Anil Prabhakar,
Advocates for State.
SI Lal Chand, P.S. V.K. South.
Mr. Sandeep Chandra, Mr. Eaneev
Chandra, Advocates for complainant
with complainant (in-Person).

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV NARULA

ORDER

% **26.05.2025**

1. The present petition under Section 528 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023¹ read with Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure² is directed against judgment dated 31st May, 2022, passed by the Metropolitan Magistrate, Patiala House Courts, in CTC No. 46344/2016, pursuant to an application filed by Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 under Section

¹ "BNSS"

² "Cr.P.C."



12 of the Protection of Women from Domestic Violence Act, 2005.³

2. Briefly stated, the factual background leading to the filing of the present petition is that Petitioner No. 1 and Respondent No. 2 got married on 4th February, 2014 as per Hindu rites and ceremonies. From this marriage, a daughter (Respondent No. 3) was born on 29th January, 2016. However, on account of temperamental difference and other reasons, the parties started residing separately since June 2016. Petitioner Nos. 2 and 3 are the father and mother of Petitioner No. 1 respectively.

3. Respondent Nos. 2 and 3 filed a complaint under Section 12 of the DV Act against the Petitioners before the MM, Patiala House Courts, New Delhi. The MM, *vide* impugned order dated 31st May, 2022, issued certain directions to the Petitioners for one-time compensation to the Respondents to the following effect:

18. Further, considering the fact that aggrieved has suffered mental agony due to the domestic abuse by respondent nos. 1, 2 and 3, thus, the said respondent no.1 is directed to pay one time compensation for sum of Rs. 7.00.000/- to the aggrieved and Rs.5,00.000/- (Fixed Deposit) to the daughter. Respondent no. 2 is directed to pay one time compensation for sum of Rs.50,000/- and Respondent no. 3 is directed to pay one time compensation for sum of: Rs.1,00,000/- to the aggrieved. The compensation awarded shall be paid within one year from the date of the order. In default of payment of the same, the same would be realized as fine under Section 421 Cr.P.C.

4. Aggrieved by the impugned order, the Petitioners preferred separate appeals. However, the appeal preferred by Respondent No. 1 was dismissed by the Sessions Court on 15th May, 2024. Similarly, the appeal filed by Petitioners No. 2 and 3 was dismissed on 3rd October, 2024.

5. Pertinently, prior to the adjudication of the appeal preferred by

³ “DV Act”



Petitioners No. 2 and 3, the parties amicably resolved their disputes and executed a Settlement Agreement dated 29th August, 2024 before the Mediation Centre at Patiala House Courts. As per the terms of the said agreement, the parties undertook to bring an end to all pending litigations, which included, *inter alia*, the withdrawal of the present proceedings and the quashing of FIR No. 649/2016, registered at P.S. Vasant Kunj at the instance of Respondent No. 2. In consideration thereof, the Petitioners paid a total sum of INR 16,50,000/- to Respondent No. 2, in addition to certain jewellery items enumerated in Clause 5.6 of the settlement agreement. In furtherance of the settlement, the aforesaid FIR was quashed by this Court *vide* order dated 21st May, 2025 passed in CRL.M.C. 2663/2025.

6. The existence and validity of the aforesaid settlement are not in dispute. Respondent No. 2, who is present before this Court, along with her counsel, affirms the settlement and acknowledges receipt of the full consideration as agreed therein. It is further submitted by counsel for Respondent No. 2 that, in light of the settlement, the execution petition previously filed by her for enforcement of the impugned order dated 31st May, 2022, has also been withdrawn. The present petition has thus, been preferred solely to seek formal closure and annulment of the impugned order dated 31st May, 2022.

7. Having regard to the factum of settlement, which stands duly affirmed by both parties, this Court is of the considered view that the continued subsistence of the impugned order, as well as the appellate orders dated 15th May, 2024 and 3rd October, 2024, would serve no fruitful purpose. Accordingly, it is declared that the aforementioned impugned orders are rendered non-enforceable and parties shall remain bound only by terms of settlement.



8. In view of the above directions, the present petition stands disposed of along with pending application.

SANJEEV NARULA, J

MAY 26, 2025

as